MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

March, 1950

Volume Eleven — Number One

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS
SEATTLE

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Edited by

EDWARD GODFREY COX
Managing Editor

Direct Contributions and Business Correspondence to
Managing Editor, Modern Language Quarterly
Parrington Hall
University of Washington
Seattle 5

Subscription price $2.00 per year • Single copies $0.75
Issued in March, June, September, December

Entered as second-class matter May 6, 1940, at the post office at Seattle, Washington, under the Act of March 3, 1879

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Volume Eleven **March, 1950** **Number One**

ARTICLES

REVIEWS

THOMAS CAMPION, AN ELIZABETHAN NEO-CLASSICIST

By Catharine W. Peltz

At the conclusion of his short word "To the Reader" prefixed to *A Book of Airs* (1601), Thomas Campion refers to Catullus and Virgil as exemplifiers of the genres of lyric and heroic poetry respectively in such a manner as to imply that they are of equal importance to Roman literature. Such an estimate of the value of the lyric was unusual in an age imbued with the classic emphasis upon the superiority of epic and dramatic poetry.[1] It would seem that this critical perception of Campion's was born through his own lyric achievement, an achievement that has been somewhat overshadowed by that of Ben Jonson.

It is evident that Campion's lyrics reveal again and again qualities which are natively English, altogether Elizabethan: for example, the closeness to folk poetry of "Jack and Joan they think no ill"[2]; the innocent exuberance of "And would you see my mistress' face"; the music of "What then is love but mourning?"; the impish fairy lore of "Hark, all you ladies that do sleep!" in spite of its frequent mention of Proserpina:

> Hark, all you ladies that do sleep!
> The fairy-queen Proserpina
> Bids you awake and pity them that weep
>   You may do in the dark
>   What the day doth forbid;
> Fear not the dogs that bark,
>   Night will have all hid.
> But if you let your lovers moan,
> The fairy-queen Proserpina
> Will send abroad her fairies every one
> That shall pinch black and blue
> Your white hands and fair arms
> That did not kindly rue
>   Your paramours' harms.

Moreover, through this side of him, so truly Elizabethan, Campion captures in his occasional free adaptations of the love poems of Roman poets—notably of Catullus and of Propertius—the richness of their imagery, the passionate, full-blooded quality of their lines, as Jonson rarely does. This will be seen by comparing the opening lines of Jonson's "Song to Celia"

[1] In "The Renaissance Forerunners of the Neo-Classic Lyrics," *MLN*, LXII (1947), 314-15, Herbert W. Schueller illustrates aptly the usual Renaissance critic's attitude of scorn toward the lyric.

[2] The edition of Thomas Campion's poetry used throughout this discussion is that in the Muses' Library, ed. Percival Vivian.

Come my Celia, let us prove,
While we may, the sports of love;
Time will not be ours, forever:
He, at length, our good will sever.
Send not then his guifts in vaine
Sunnes, that set, may rise againe:
But if once we loose this light,
'Tis with us perpetuall night.

with the beginning of Campion's poem which is also derived from Catullus, *Carmina,* 5:[3]

My sweetest Lesbia, let us live and love;
And though the Sager sort our deeds reprove
Let us not weigh them: heaven's great lamps do dive
Into their west, and straight again revive:
But as soon as once set is our little light,
Then must we sleep one ever-during night.

Yet even more dominant than the Elizabethan aspect just described is a less-known aspect of Campion's lyric verse—his insistence upon the importance of form. There is evidenced in his lines a sustained effort to create lyrics in classical metrical molds and to incorporate in many of his lyrics the kind of subject matter and the qualities of style inherent in the writings of Anacreon, of Horace in his lighter *Carmina,* of Ovid in many of his love elegies. His *Observations in the Art of English Poesie* (1602) is written for the express purpose of denouncing native poetic practices and lauding classic example. In its dedication to Lord Buckhurst, he asserts,

For this end [the end of "helping the eare" and "raysing the mind" through poetry] have I studyed to induce a true forme of versefying into our language: for the vulgar and unarteficiall custome of riming hath, I know, deter'd many excellent arts from the exercise of English poesy.[4]

In the critical discussion which follows, he lists several classic poetic genres and seeks to clarify his remarks about each by printing poems of his own which approximate classical meters in English as nearly as it is possible to do. In none of these pieces does he use end rhyme. His epigrams, twelve in number, are written in continuous trochaic pentameter lines and consist of gibes at individuals, for the most part in the manner of Martial; his single elegy, in couplets consisting of an iambic pentameter line and a trochaic tetrameter line; his "Ditties and Odes," three in number, in short trochaic stanzas, one of which seeks to imitate "Saphick" verse; his "Anacreontick verse," one example

---

[3] Catullus, *Carmina,* 5. 1-6:

Vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus,
rumor esque senum severiorum
omnes unius aestimemus assis.
Soles occidere et redire possunt:
nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux,
nox est perpetua una dormienda.

[4] *Observations,* in *Elizabethan Critical Essays,* ed. G. Gregory Smith (Oxford, 1904), II, 325.

given, in continuous trochaic dimeter lines, a medium which is, he says, "in respect of the rest imperfect . . . yet it is passing gracefull in our English toong."[5] One concludes, however, that Campion's notable success in at least two of these lyrics[6] was due to his own poetic genius, which enabled him to capture in English the finely chiselled smoothness and lightness of touch resident in so many classic lyrics.[7] Campion attests directly to his consciousness of these elements in poetry, elements which may be the very essence of a poem, reaching far beneath external metrical form:

> The Apothecaries have Books of Gold, whose leaves, being opened are so light as that they are subject to be shaken with the least breath; yet rightly handled, they serve both for ornament and use. Such are light Airs.[8]

Many of the lyrics in his four Books of Airs, using metrical forms more spontaneously than in his rather self-conscious performance in *Observations* and employing end rhyme with notable success, are continued evidence of the inherent classic strain in Campion's creative writing: there is the neat antithesis of "Though you are young, and I am old"; the cynicism, the emphasis upon woman's fickleness of "If I urge my kind desires"; the sophistication and physical suggestion of "I care not for these ladies"; the dramatic form and narrative element of "My love hath vowed he will forsake me"; the disillusionment of "Whether men do laugh or weep," its apt parallel phrasing and its use of conventional figures destined to make their appearance again and again in subsequent lyrics.[9]

> The world [he writes] is made by simmetry and proportion, and is in that respect compared to Musick, and Musick to Poetry; for Terence saith, speaking of Poets, artem qui tractant musicam, confounding Musick and Poesy together. What music can there be where there is no proportion observed?[10]

This statement might well be a part of Ben Jonson's *Discoveries* in its directness, its clear-cut classic emphasis. One is tempted to ask at this point why, with such critical insight and with such lyric achievement to his credit, Campion's influence was not more pervasive in his own day and in subsequent generations? It would seem, first, that his advocacy of approximating classic meters in English lacked the sturdy common sense of Jonson's point of view upon the same subject. Moreover, Campion's own creative writing was composed of

[5] *Observations*, in Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 349.

[6] "Rose-cheeked Laura, Come" written in quatrain form to illustrate "Ditties and Odes" and "Follow, follow" in continuous trochaic dimeters to illustrate "Anacreontick verse."

[7] In all Campion's poetry, there is no better example of classic simplicity combined with firmness of outline than the well-known "When to her lute Corinna sings."

[8] "To the Reader," *Fourth Book of Airs*, in *Poems*, ed. Vivian, p. 104.

[9] See Mr. Schueller's article referred to earlier in this discussion for an excellent and full treatment of the importance of the musical requirements of the madrigal and the air in shaping Campion's verse.

[10] *Observations*, in Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 329.

diverse strains and often proved to be inconsistent with the principles voiced in his *Observations*. Lastly, he was primarily a musician; his creative writing consisted principally in the composition of short lyrics written for musical accompaniment, a genre the literary importance of which was treated very lightly in the early seventeenth century, even more lightly than that of the lyrics not written for musical accompaniment. On the other hand, Jonson, a classic scholar, a well-known writer of dramas, a writer of various other classic genres more esteemed in his own day than was the lyric, was in a position to imprint deeply upon his contemporaries and those followers who came after him his conception of lyric poetry. Jonson's role was that of the conscious builder previous to whom a few sporadic experiments had been made as to the possibility of establishing an English lyric based securely upon classic foundations.

Is it too much to say, however, that of the few earlier efforts to imitate consciously such a lyric purpose as Jonson's in English literature, Thomas Campion's achievement—an achievement both enriched and confused by an Elizabethan strain in his lyricism unrelated to neo-classicism—is of first importance?

New York State College for Teachers, Albany

SIXTEENTH-CENTURY STAGECRAFT IN EUROPEAN DRAMA: A SURVEY

By L. A. Triebel

European stagecraft in the sixteenth century has formed the subject of ever-increasing interest and discussion since Gaedertz's discovery at Utrecht in 1888 of a sketch representing the interior of the Swan Theater about 1596, a copy of a drawing made by De Witt, a Dutch visitor to Elizabethan London. The foci of attention, in England and Germany respectively, have been the mode of producing Shakespeare's plays in his day in the London public theaters and the reconstruction of the stage of the Meistersingers under Hans Sachs in Nuremberg.

Illustrations depicting the simple classical stage of humanistic dramas, if not of their offshoot, the school-plays, are very numerous in early editions of Terence during the Renaissance; the "two trestles and a board" that sufficed for popular interludes, farces, and Shrovetide plays during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were also depicted by a few contemporaries. In addition, several detailed plans for the performances of Mystery plays are extant, particularly for Valenciennes and Lucerne, as well as sketches of the English variant, the "pageants," which supplement our full information for imagining their staging in Europe generally. The modern "picture" stage, with its use of perspective scenery and its front curtain, was born at the turning point of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Italy; thence it slowly spread first to the French and English and, later, to the German courts. Much pictorial material relating to such courtly entertainments, mainly masques, is preserved.

The popular drama has, in point of fact, been less generous than the early religious, classical, and courtly types, in bequeathing to us pictorial evidence of its stagecraft. Hence the value as authentic testimony of De Witt's rough drawing, and the search for further similar legacy handed down by the popular stage. The only fully illustrated contemporary document of European theaters is Rasser's Alsatian playbook of the "Kinderzucht"; its sixty-six woodcuts, forty-four of them different, were made shortly after the 1573 performance in the marketplace of Ensisheim. In them the artist depicts the setting and sections of the actual stage at almost every moment of the play. I was able to prove, for the first time, that the *mise en scène* shown by the illustrator accords with the exigencies of the action, and that Rasser's staging of the "Kinderzucht" is of a definite type in the evolution of western European stagecraft.[1]

[1] *Rasser of Alsace,* a thesis deposited in the Library of the University of Tasmania.

Primitive drama, Christian and pagan, was essentially religious in origin. The Middle Ages strongly felt the mystery and wonder of the religious life; hence it is not surprising that the instinct of self-abasement found an outlet in the dramatization of Biblical and ecclesiastical history; ritual became art. Such medieval drama, as preserved in literature, is preëminently the record of playwrights who desired to express their inferiority to the personages of scriptural and saintly history. A reverent sadness is the predominant strain in liturgical plays, as long as the interior of the church remained their stage. With the evolution of religious drama from liturgy to Mystery and Passion play, acted in the open with an ever-increasing popular element, the early setting proper to the interior of the church was retained in essentials.

The setting of a play fixes its locality, and the latter is the producer's chief concern. What then was the staging of the European liturgical drama as developed from the service of the Mass? Its essential convention was uninfluenced by the practice and traditions of medieval *jongleurs* and *Spielleute,* the descendants through the dim ages of the Roman *mimi.* All scenes and localities demanded were placed before the audience at one and the same time; multiple or simultaneous setting was born within the walls of the medieval cathedral and church, whence it spread to market-square and village-green, with the action playing on level ground or on a raised platform stage.

Multiple setting consists of two or more fixed localities and an intervening or adjacent stretch of unlocalized ground, often termed "platea," to represent any place that might be required for the action, such as the road (nave of the church) along which travel the three women seeking the body of Jesus in the tomb (altar). The latter defined locality is one of the earliest known "mansions." An additional mansion in this scene would denote a stall for the seller of ointments. As the Mystery grew out of the Easter and Nativity playlets until it spanned the history of the world, the number of fixed mansions, also termed stations and houses, increased. By foreshortening of distance, even Heaven and Hell remained within view of the audience throughout. All localities were arranged side by side as on a map, the acting personages moving from one to another, as from Gethsemane to the praetorium and to Calvary. The Donaueschingen Passion play of the sixteenth century shows twenty-two mansions.

In Catholic Lucerne an Easter play was still regularly given from 1545 until 1567, and, for 1583, the plans of an elaborate late embodiment of the old tradition on two successive days were sketched by Renwart Cysat, who, as *régisseur,* expressed satisfaction that Protestants also crowded to the Lucerne Easter plays and were edified thereby. From the sketches it appears that the market-square was the "theater," with Heaven, a turreted mansion, the seat of the Eternal Father and His seven angels, at the eastern end; at the opposite end

of the square and to the left-hand side a many-toothed monster represented Hell. The other mansions were set along the four sides of the square, e.g., the Temple surmounted by a cupola and a crescent, a table for the Last Supper, and a tree on which Judas Iscariot could hang himself. At the southern end, alongside of Hell, was erected a platform stage (*brücke*) over the "Brunnen," and on it were set other mansions, among them the Savior's grave and a pillar for the scourging. Both on this stage and around the square the positions of participating actors are indicated in Cysat's sketches.

The French custom of presenting *mystères* left rather more to the imagination and made greater demands on credulity. The mansions were set up at the back of the stage with the "platea" in front. At Valenciennes in 1547 Heaven and Hell were separated by eight mansions, but some were purely symbolic—a door for a city and an armchair for a palace.

A very complete set of stage directions for the *Mystère* represented at Mons in 1501 was recovered by Gustave Cohen in 1922, and bears out our knowledge of the elaborate character of the "machines" used at that period. Amiens and Chauny lent their properties, and Amiens lent the tent. The stage was more than forty yards long and about twenty wide, and stood against a row of houses in the Grand-Place. The stage itself was covered with earth and grass to suit the illusion of the mansions appearing on a field. A "parcque" was seated for spectators. At the back of the stage were the various mansions or edifices, painted in bright heraldic colors. Canopies with sun and moon and golden stars hung over Paradise; a tent protected Hell, "plein de bruit, de flammes, de grimaces et de menaces." Serpents made of basket-work crawled on the stage near Lucifer, and a "machine" for making thunder enhanced the terror of the place. Towers and castles, representing Rome, Bethlehem, and Nazareth, flanked the stage between Hell and Paradise, where God the Father, clad in a fur-trimmed robe and wearing gloves, sat surrounded by angels.

The French practice of having symbolic rather than realistic rear mansions was due to the desire of spectators to get a clearer view from three sides than was possible with stations set along three or even four sides of the "campus." In all settings so far mentioned, the open space in front of or surrounded by the mansions was unlocalized; it was "anywhere" and termed "platea," "playne," or "plan," according to the language, and was felt to be distinct from the fixed stations.

Again, in Italy the mechanics of the production of *sacre rappresentazioni* also showed well-defined multiple setting, with, however, a curious variation in that Paradise, Earth, and Heaven were on three different levels. The raised Paradise (*scena superiore*) for God the Father could be closed and opened by an early type of curtain, an arrangement sometimes found elsewhere, e.g., in the Netherlands, and persisting in the "pageant" form of stage favored in England for per-

formances of the Miracles, but not general outside of Italy. From the Italian fashion also came the old, erroneous ascription of threefold to the German stage. At the rear of the Italian stages were set the *luoghi deputati*; in front of these was the neutral space.

In England the stationary multiple setting for Mysteries was not common. The main evidence lies in the remains of Cornish "rounds" or amphitheaters of earth or stone, possibly built in the Roman tradition. Manuscripts of Cornish plays show details of the arrangement of the various mansions as placed on the circumference of the circle. Allardyce Nicoll aptly compares them with the diagram contained in the manuscript of the *Castle of Perseverance,* which is the earliest extant English Morality and one into which simultaneous setting has been adopted. Here a moat is seen to surround the platea, in the middle of which stands a castle; below is indicated a bed for Mankind. On the edge of the circle are the mansions. God's scaffold is to the east, Belial is stationed in the north, with the World in the west and Caro in the south. Evidently here is an arrangement still preserving the ancient church setting with Heaven in the east over the altar, and with the north as the seat of the devil, this being the principle also in the plans for Lucerne and Donaueschingen.

The typically English *mise en scène* for the later religious plays differed. It has its parallel in the *wagenspel* of the Netherlands, and, exceptional for Germany, at Lübeck in the sixteenth century, doubtless based on the Flemish model. The method originated in the Corpus Christi processions. In Lübeck, as in England, various guilds organized the performances, but the German repertory consisted mainly of farces.

The actors in the great English religious cycles of York, Chester, and Coventry stood on stages or movable scaffolds, termed "pageants," wheeled from station to station. A spectator standing at the first station would see the Creation acted on the first craft, followed by the Adam and Eve scene on the second; the Cain and Abel scene would be shown on the third, and so on. Various single plays in the series would thus be enacted simultaneously at different street corners of a particular town; so, in principle, multiple setting is preserved, but it is modified in practical Anglo-Saxon fashion for the convenience of the public and of the players who were members of guilds, each company of handicraftsmen being allotted a suitable pageant, e.g., the watermen and shipwrights that of Noah. The street in front of a pageant would be the unlocalized platea—"and here Herod rages in the pageant and in the street also" is an indication of its utility in the Coventry plays. The last performance of the York cycle was in 1579. Archdeacon Rogers saw the Chester plays performed in 1594, and has left an account of the method of representation which brings the whole scene before us vividly enough.

Every company had his pageant, or part, which pageants were a high scaffold with two rooms, a higher and a lower, upon four wheels. In the lower they apparelled themselves, and in the higher room they played, being all open on the top, that all beholders might hear and see them. The places where they played them was in every street. They began first at the Abbey gates, and when the first pageant was played it was wheeled to the High Cross before the Mayor, and so to every street; and so every street had a pageant playing before them at one time, till all the pageants for the day appointed were played; and when one pageant was near ended, word was brought from street to street, that so they might come in place thereof exceeding orderly, and all the streets have their pageants afore them all at one time playing together; to see which plays was great resort, and also scaffolds and stages made in the streets in those places where they determined to play their pageants.

The zest of the performances may be gathered from the Noah playlet in the Chester cycle, which, on account of its stage directions for scenery and properties, merits attention. It has unusually elaborate instructions for stage paintings: the birds and beasts to go into the ark are to be painted on the "borde" and are enumerated. Now, in some of the Rasser pictures, particularly the sixteenth woodcut, there are figured decorations in the background, suggesting a painter's work rather than tapestry. As there is evidence in the records of the Passion players and of the Meistersingers, as well as of the English guilds, for the payment of painters for work done, it is likely that in both countries there was some tradition of painted scenery accounting for the designs and faces in the arras or hangings mentioned in Elizabethan plays and making the sixteenth-century settings often more realistic than was for long supposed.

Multiple setting and, it must be confessed, a multiple theme, the old history of man and of God's dealings with him, characterize these cycles of religious drama in Western Europe that attained their height in the sixteenth century; long after the dawn of the Renaissance they retained their luster in the eyes of the populace. It is recorded that Cysat's first day's action of the Easter play was given in Lucerne as early as 1571, two years before Rasser's "Kinderzucht" in Ensisheim; Biblical plays were also performed in Colmar, Strassburg, and elsewhere in Alsace in 1560, 1564, 1567, and in May, 1573; in the latter month Meyenbrunn's drama on John the Baptist required two days for its staging in Colmar. If the creator of Hamlet himself saw no Miracles in his native town, his wording, like "the vice of kings" and "it out-herods Herod," often gives credence to the belief that as a boy he betook himself to the old city of the Midlands and saw the raging Herod, the roaring devil of hell-mouth, and other scenic marvels on the pageants of Coventry, an influence of a kind that lesser playwrights of that day were not likely to escape.

Whereas the religious plays had their own elaborate and traditional system of multiple setting, the extant contemporary depictions of staging for Morality and Interlude, French farce or Shrovetide play, show only a bare and narrow platform, backed by suspended curtains,

through the interstices of which the actors might come and go. Such short secular plays required very little staging at all; much of this popular secular drama immediately preceding the humanistic adaptations of Plautus and Terence had its origin in the acts of the revelers who went from house to house, sometimes in disguise, and played there or in the streets on public holidays, most often those allowed during or after Lent. Groups of citizens and artisans formed companies for the presentation of rough farces in halls; the Basochiens and the Enfants sans souci of Paris, the Meistersingers of Nuremberg and other German cities are instances in point; moreover, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* Shakespeare reminds us of the survival of the custom in his England. From their simple stages, "two trestles and a board," on to which the necessary properties were carried, later developed the platform stage of the English professional actors.

Technically, I think, "simple popular stage" meant having the stage at one time represent one place; indeed, not necessarily a particular place. If any change of scene had to be supplied, it was motivated by the words of the actors on the same stage. Properties were not barred (stool and throne were traditional), but only occasionally are one or two "stations" (*orte*) used for particular characters, as when eavesdropping is done; a scenic background is not known unless the houses of the rich or the college halls of Oxford and Cambridge provided a fortuitous costly rear setting. Considerations of space and cost, together with the slightness of the interludes and farces, all favored simple setting. Two of the contemporary French pictorial examples, the Jean de Gourmont and the Liefrinck prints, show respectively a trestled stage curtained at the rear and full of performers, and a bare stage with curtains from which one of the characters peers.

A third French picture illustrating the performance of a farce in the sixteenth century is not generally noted. It shows a dispute between husband and wife in front of the curtains but not the stage itself; with reference to the other actors it has been said, "Il y a en plus le procureur et quatre personnages derrière les rideaux flottants attendant leur tour d'entrer (les coulisses sont créées)." However, from some of Rasser's illustrations (numbers 2, 18, 30, and 37) it might be seen that Alsace was very early in adopting an elementary form of wings. In point of fact, the modern principle of successive or simple staging is established for the older secular plays everywhere, from their very nature, as much as for the classical stage of the humanists, as opposed to that of the Mysteries. In Germany, the early revue-type of "Fastnachtspiel" developed so that the rear wall or curtain was utilized; actors took up their cues and made their *entrée de théâtre*; a stage is set, even if its boundaries are not yet firmly fixed. So, too, the English Interludes played in the halls of the great or in schools and colleges made use of a wall with doors. According to Sir Edmund Chambers, the great bulk of the Interludes call for no change of local-

ity; the action is either wholly undefined or but vaguely indicated. It is often referred to in stage directions and dialogue as "the place," corresponding to the old platea. A slightly later type of stage set up in the open in Madrid during 1623 for a performance in honor of the visit paid by Prince Charles of England is depicted by a well-known print, conveniently reproduced in Baker's *The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist*. From this it appears that the platform was at least ten feet high. At the rear is a booth with front and side curtains. The comedians include a court fool and a clown, while the orchestra is seated against the back curtain. The height of the stage was necessitated by the area of the surrounding open plain. The similarity of this Spanish stage to earlier platform stages is very evident.

The bare stage of the folk-plays and of the *Spielleute* made for simplicity, so that classical staging was readily assimilated by it. In essence the strictly humanistic setting, derived from Vitruvius' account of the ancient stage, consisted of an elevated platform with a background through which doors were cut. From early illustrated editions of Plautus and Terence, it is apparent that the doors represented houses; but all the action took place in front of the houses, and the scene was any place where people could come together and talk. Street scenes were the fashion in Roman comedy, aided as they were by favorable weather. From the description in Vitruvius of the *periaktoi* came also the first hints for a shifting background with moving scenes, while the principle of successive sets concealed and discovered by curtains spread from Italy to other countries, but only comparatively late in the seventeenth century.

Classical Roman plays were revived in the academies and courts of Italy at the close of the fifteenth century, while the renewed interest in the literatures of the ancients brought to light Vitruvius' treatise on their architecture and spread a knowledge of the old Greek and Roman theaters. Illustrations to contemporary editions of Terence already indicate clearly the principle of classical settings. Behind the "proscenium," corresponding to the platea, is a row of "scenae" with curtained doors, separated from each other by columns. This rear set is thus divided into compartments, usually three, four, or five in number, with a moulding extending across all of them and bearing over each scena the name of the personage in the play the door to whose "domus" it represents. At one or both ends of the scenae there is sometimes an entrance that would serve for the appearance of a character coming from a distance, or for some other reason not naturally stepping out of one of the "houses." Neil Brooks notes that in slightly later editions of Terence in Italy the dividing pillars disappear, giving a continuous series of curtains, with the retention, however, of the names on the moulding to indicate the individual houses. The pictorial representations agree with contemporary accounts of performances at Ferrara in 1486, and at Rome in 1499, each showing five houses on the stage.

In the well-known edition of Terence, issued at Lyons in 1493, each play is adorned with a series of woodcuts, reproducing, like the Rasser pictures, various moments in the plot and the full stage. In all three, illustrating the Andria, the rear setting on the square platform stage is constant; a back wall is made up of five simple columns that support four rounded arches, the spaces between the columns being closed by curtains. Each compartment denotes the house of one character; the superscriptions are Carini, Chreme, Chrisidis, and Do. Symonis. In the second woodcut the curtain to the domus Chrisidis is drawn, revealing the character seated within. The classical basis of unchanged locality, i.e., simple setting, is thus seen to be the distinctive form of humanistic staging, as it was to be in the magnificent theaters erected during the later Italian Renaissance.

The general features of the classical proscenium, with scenic additions, are still preserved in the Teatro Olimpico erected at Vicenza and completed in 1584. The stately proscenium is pierced by three arches—a large one in the center, a smaller one on each side, and two yet smaller forming side entrances. Through each of these arches is seen in perspective a complete Renaissance street ascending in curiously deceptive relief. As early as 1508 at the Florentine ducal court a stage had been erected with painted scenery showing the town of Ferrara in perspective with a street, houses, and gardens; the painter and the architect here developed the tradition based on the classical unity of place as opposed to that of the religious cycles from which they may have adopted only the *case*. Again, in the Roman stage erected for the Medici in 1513, the arches of the proscenium were widened, and through each was seen a street in perspective, the two smallest openings serving as side entrances. Architectural rear and upper decorations are noted also for the performance of Aristoto's "Suppositi" before the Pope in 1519, at the beginning of which a painted front curtain fell and revealed a prospect of Ferrara produced by Raphael. The device of a front curtain and the enlargement of the central "door," together with scenery in perspective, were marked steps in the evolution of the picture stage; Rome with its papal splendor became the cradle of modern stagecraft.

Dramaturgically, the influence of the Europeans who composed Latin plays during the sixteenth century helped to drive out the vast Mysteries and formless Shrovetide plays. The division into acts and scenes, together with motivation of exits and entrances, as well as the use of messengers to report happenings, involving as it did the distinction between action on and action off stage, was part of the rich legacy bequeathed to drama by the Renaissance.

The Netherlands first imitated the Italian setting of Renaissance rear façades. Two pictures showing stages at Ghent and Antwerp in 1539 and 1561 have flanking doorways between which the one has three doors, the other a wide curtain. Both show an innovation which,

in my opinion, influences the Elizabethan public theater—a balcony or upper stage enabling two "discoveries" (*vertooningen*) to be made at the same time the action was played on the main stage. English merchants and soldiers abroad would have opportunities of seeing the Rederijker perform. The practical simplicity of the new London playhouses from 1576 onwards, however, stands in marked contrast with the magnificence of Renaissance staging abroad; however elaborate English performances at Elizabeth's court were, there is evidence here rather for the persistence of multiple settings, the scenery consisting of painted frames with pictures of the places between which the action moved.

Thus within a comparatively short period in the sixteenth century there comes to light ample pictorial evidence of widely different, though still contemporary, systems of staging, medieval and classical, multiple and simple or successive, with a more or less elaborate proscenium façade, and, for Italy, a front curtain and sets of scenery in perspective. In the light of this pictorial evidence, reconstructions of "typical" stages must surely become less common than they were. Hence, despite Sir Edmund Chambers, it is evident that we should abandon or modify the time-honored notions of a typical "Elizabethan stage," as well as the German alternation theory, i.e., the alternate use of inner and outer stages for successive scenes, to which Kaulfusz-Diesch clung and which Flemming modified in a more scholarly spirit for Gryphius. All evidence bearing on the performance of a play in a particular place, and, it must ever be kept in mind, the exigencies of the dramatic action, must be taken into account. Resemblances, but few generalizations, have resulted.

The most renowned of all the sixteenth-century stages, that of the Shakespearean public theater, remains for brief consideration in relation to contemporary theatrical practice in other countries. The De Witt drawing comes nearer to substantiating Sir Edmund Chambers. It shows a wooden circular structure, an amphitheater, with a scaffold or apron stage. Its main features are: (1) the "yard," providing standing room; (2) the "proscenium," in its modern sense of the stage in front of the scena—it possessed a trap-door and was probably paled in; (3) three tiers of galleries; (4) an upper stage or balcony, i.e., that part of the first gallery running over the back of the proscenium and which served as rampart, hillock, or window; (5) the scena or "tire-house," where "the actors made them ready," pierced by two folding doors—there is other evidence for hangings over the door; the middle recess serves as study, bedroom, shop, tent, cave, and tomb; (6) a roof over the stage on two pillars—the "penthouse," corresponding to the cover or shadow of the Fortune theater; (7) the hut over 4, 5, and 6, surmounted by the Swan flag.

Not until Ayrer, whose "brücken" is a platform stage, at the end of the sixteenth century, does German drama betray the influence of

the more advanced stagecraft of the English professional actors. It has been affirmed that the English comedians in Germany brought with them the setting of the Shakespearean platform stage with its front and rear stages. However, although the English players were the first to make use of an upper stage or balcony, as at Cassel and Regensburg, there is, for Germany, no decisive evidence of a curtained inner stage before the middle of the seventeenth century. Moreover, "our cast despised Stage players," as they were termed by Fynes Moryson who saw them at Frankfort, would be more accustomed to the cruder stages of English provincial towns. Changeable scenery for successive sets was not feasible until the introduction of the Italian method of shutting off the whole stage from the auditorium by a single curtain. The transition in Germany from platform stage to picture stage took place gradually from the middle of the seventeenth century and, as H. C. Lancaster showed, a little earlier in France.

Shakespeare's stage is, in point of fact, a natural step in the evolution from medieval to modern practice. On Elizabethan public stages the "platea" (neutral place) has become the front stage, while the localized and propertied stations of the older system have their counterparts in the inner (alcove) and upper (balcony) stages, although, to my mind, the classical "houses" are even more convincing counterparts. Moreover, classical "successive" staging is, as a rule, the Elizabethan theatrical fashion. The growing importance of the inner stage and the cutting down of the apron stage, together with the more extensive use of scenery in perspective, belong to the history of the Restoration period in England, to a slightly earlier period in France, and to the time of Gryphius and Rist in German drama.

University of Tasmania

THE PHILOSOPHY OF FRANCIS JEFFREY

By BYRON GUYER*

Commentary on the literary criticism of Francis Jeffrey offers various descriptions and explanations of his critical views. Professor George R. Saintsbury tells us that although Francis Jeffrey possessed a Gallic temperament which made him hostile to romanticism, yet he could not heartily enjoy French literature.[1] Professor Merritt Y. Hughes asserts that Jeffrey could not reconcile truth and beauty, and that as a latter-day Platonist he always preferred truth to beauty.[2] Professor J. Raymond Derby argues that Jeffrey's native common sense was at war with his sentimentality.[3] Alike in asserting that Jeffrey's criticism suffers from containing irreconcilable tenets, these opinions differ merely in what those beliefs are. Professor Russell Noyes has revived the argument that Jeffrey's criticism is inconsistent and often malicious;[4] and Professor Robert Daniel recently asserted that once we perceive that Jeffrey had *no* critical position, that like a good lawyer he attacked where the poet was weakest, our misunderstandings of this critic are resolved.[5]

A few apologists (Herbert Read, Joseph Beatty, Hugh Chisolm, and William Minto) point out that even those who laugh at Jeffrey are in the habit of repeating the substance of his remarks on *The Excursion*.[6] R. C. Bald, Lewis E. Gates, and D. Nicol Smith have written excellent descriptions of Jeffrey's criticism without the apologetics.[7] This commentary is alike in one respect; none of it relates Jeffrey's critical remarks to his reviews of contemporary philosophers, and little of it has even in cursory fashion related the criticism to the aesthetics which Jeffrey adopted. His theory of beauty is, with a few minor exceptions, the same as Archibald Alison's. Jeffrey's *Essay on Beauty*, first written in his student days, is clearly an adaptation of

*January 26 of this year was the centenary of Francis Jeffrey's death.

[1] *Collected Essays and Papers of George Saintsbury, 1875-1920* (New York, 1923), I, 79-105.

[2] "The Humanism of Francis Jeffrey," *Modern Language Review*, XVI (1921), 243-49.

[3] "The Paradox of Francis Jeffrey: Reason versus Sensibility," *Modern Language Quarterly*, VII (1946), 489-500.

[4] "Wordsworth and Jeffrey in Controversy," *Indiana University Publications, Humanities Series*, No. 5 (1941).

[5] "Jeffrey and Wordsworth," *Sewanee Review*, I (1942), 195-213.

[6] Herbert Read, *Wordsworth*, The Clark Lectures, 1929-30 (London, 1930). Joseph Beatty, "Lord Jeffrey and Wordsworth," *PMLA*, XXXVIII (1923), 221-35.

Hugh Chisolm and William Minto, "William Wordsworth," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. (New York, 1911), XXVIII, 827-32.

[7] R. C. Bald, "Francis Jeffrey as a Literary Critic," *The Nineteenth Century*, XCVII (1925), 201-05.

Selections from the Essays of Francis Jeffrey, ed. Lewis E. Gates, Athenaeum Press Series (Boston, 1894).

Jeffrey's Literary Criticism, ed. D. Nicol Smith (London, 1910).

Alison's *Essays on the Nature and Principles of Taste.* The essay was modified so as to appear as a review of Alison's *Essays* in the *Edinburgh Review* of May, 1811; and as Jeffrey noted in the publication of his periodical essays in collected form, a modification of this text became the article on beauty in the supplement to the seventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica.*[8] The critic's acceptance of the aesthetics of Alison places him much nearer the center of romanticism than has been generally realized. Francis Jeffrey shared these opinions with the essayists of his time: beauty is emotion produced by contemplation of an outer object which suggests ideas and feelings through association; the Elizabethans, including the writers of poetic prose, are the supreme littérateurs in human history; Shakespeare no doubt errs but his errors are of little account, since while sacrificing correctness he rose to the heights of creative genius; the literature of the Age of Anne is coldly correct, insipid, and lacking in genius and poetic fervor; the writers of Queen Anne's reign allowed caution to curb their genius; Pope is a moralist and wit but not a poet; the writers of Jeffrey's age stand above those of the eighteenth century because they possess poetic genius which rises above mere correctness. But Jeffrey did not prefer a literary treatment of the distant past to the ordinary present, and he did not prefer the mysterious to the familiar. He preferred the realistic passages of Scott's historical novels to the poetry; he scorned Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister,* but he liked Jane Austen and Maria Edgeworth; although he believed Keats possessed the highest kind of poetic genius, his personal preference was for the poetry of George Crabbe. These opinions seem inconsistent with the others just mentioned, but the inconsistency is mere illusion. When Jeffrey's philosophy is understood, it is seen that his associationist aesthetics occurs in the framework of his positivistic outlook, and that his positivism prevents his acceptance of any of the philosophical idealisms usually associated with such an aesthetic.[9] Jeffrey always stops short of the elaborate speculative systems of idealist philosophers because his own philosophical belief demands it; his refusal to accept the philosophies customarily associated with romantic aesthetics has a clear philosophical justification. A brief examination of the critic's essays on philosophers of his time will enable us to understand Jeffrey's position,[10] and a glance at some of his critical remarks will enable

---

[8] Francis Jeffrey, *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review* (Philadelphia, 1852), p. 13.

[9] I. A. Richards believes that, despite the debt to Kant, Coleridge maintained a common-sense realism in epistemology. *Coleridge on Imagination* (London, 1934), p. 63.

[10] Francis Jeffrey, "An Account of the Life and Writings of Thomas Reid," *Edinburgh Review,* III (January, 1804), 269-87; "Traités sur les Principes de Législation Civile et Pénale," IV (April, 1804), 1-26; "Academical Questions by William Drummond," VII (October, 1805), 163-85; "Memoirs of Dr. Joseph Priestly," IX (October, 1806), 137-61; "The Life and Writings of James Beattie," X (April, 1807), 171-99; "Philosophical Essays by Dugald Stewart," XVII (November, 1810), 167-211.

us to comprehend how the critic's philosophical position appears in his criticism.

In the first place, that Jeffrey had a conscious interest in philosophy we know from the note prefacing his publication of his collected essays. He writes:

> . . . having been at one time more addicted to the studies to which it [philosophy] relates than to any other . . . I could not think of letting this collection go forth . . . without *some* specimen of those [essays] which once found so much favour in my eyes.[11]

Jeffrey expresses his positivism very clearly. I wish to quote the critic at some length on this subject because his viewpoint has been almost completely overlooked.[12] Jeffrey wrote:

> Inductive philosophy, or that which proceeds upon the careful observation of facts, may be applied to two different classes of phenomena. The first are those that can be made the subject of proper experiment [by means of Bacon's Laws of Induction]; where the substances are actually in our power, and the judgment and artifice of the inquirer can be effectually employed to arrange and combine them in such a way as to disclose their most hidden properties and relations. The other class of phenomena are those that occur in substances that are placed altogether beyond our reach; and the order and succession of which we are generally unable to control; and as to which we can do little more than collect and record the laws by which they appear to be governed. Those substances are not the subject of *Experiment*, but of *Observation;* and the knowledge we may obtain . . . is of a kind that does not directly increase the power which we might otherwise have had over them. It seems evident, however, that it is principally in the former of these departments, or the strict *experimental philosophy*, that those splendid improvements have been made, which have erected so vast a trophy to the prospective genius of Bacon. . . .
>
> In the proper Experimental philosophy, every acquisition of knowledge is an increase of power; because the knowledge is necessarily derived from some intentional disposition of materials which we may always command in the same manner. In the philosophy of observation, it is merely a gratification of our curiosity.[13]

Thus Jeffrey takes the view that metaphysical speculation is limited to observation and that its only purpose is the satisfaction of human curiosity. The most profound reasonings of philosophy on perception and other primary functions of the human mind have, in Jeffrey's estimation, returned us to "the creed, and the ignorance, of the vulgar."[14] The laws of association, however, do not mystify; they best explain certain aberrations in human understanding; they afford pleasurable self-observation and mental exertion. The critic never changed his positivistic viewpoint. In 1843, in a note added to his review of Dugald Stewart's *Philosophical Essays,* Jeffrey inquired if the French

---

[11] Jeffrey, *Contributions*, p. 479.

[12] Lewis E. Gates called the critic an early positivist but did not reveal how that viewpoint influenced the critical essays. See *Selections from the Essays of Francis Jeffrey,* Introduction.

[13] Jeffrey, *Contributions*, p. 487.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 488-89.

and German metaphysics of the last thirty years had increased human power or caused any practical improvement in human affairs.[15]

Although Francis Jeffrey's dismissal of metaphysics is somewhat similar to August Comte's, the Scot saw no hope of establishing a heaven on earth. The critic believed that man could effect changes only in the realm of material phenomena, but he did not believe that such change was progress. Perhaps his pessimism is the outgrowth of a Scottish religious nature from which theology had been uprooted. Jeffrey's most careful and eloquent attack upon the belief in man's perfectibility occurs in his review of Mme de Staël's *De la Littérature dans ses Rapports avec les Institutions Sociales.*[16] The critic claims that Mme de Staël's argument for man's progress rests upon insufficient proof, and in support of his contention he notices that this French author does not mention Africa, China, Egypt, India, Persia, Greece, Thebes, Babylon, and large areas of Europe. Nevertheless, Jeffrey concedes that at least in western Europe all processes will be improved "that do not interfere with the passions of human nature, or the apparent interests of the ruling classes."[17] The critic then offers his own view. Men will continue to disagree in the future as they have disagreed in the past "with regard to everything touching morality and enjoyment. . . ." There is no *summum bonum* acceptable to all men, for all have different and often conflicting desires "through all the infinite variety, and infinite combinations of human tastes, temperaments, and habits." Furthermore, conflicting human desires are often stronger than knowledge of the consequences of gratifying wants. Man is fundamentally selfish; improvement of intellect and education do not change his basic egoism. War furnishes a good example:

> Men delight in war, in spite of the pains and miseries which they know it entails . . . because it exercises all the talents, and calls out all the energies of their nature—because it holds them out conspicuously as objects of public sentiment and general sympathy—because it gratifies their pride of art, and gives them a lofty sentiment of their own power, worth, and courage—but principally because it sets the game of existence upon a higher stake, and dispels, by its powerful interest, those feelings of *ennui* which steal upon every condition from which hazard and anxiety are excluded, and drive us into danger and suffering as a relief. While human nature continues to be distinguished by those attributes, we do not see any chance of war being superseded by the increase of wisdom and morality.[18]

The material wealth of civilization without corresponding growth in human wisdom makes many civilized men sick:

> It is a fact indeed rather perplexing and humiliating to the advocates of perfectibility . . . that those whom fortune has cruelly exempted from the necessity of

[15] Jeffrey, *Contributions,* p. 510.

[16] Jeffrey, "De la Litterature, etc. par Mme. de Stael-Holstein," *Edinburgh Review,* XX (November, 1812), 1-50. Or, *Contributions,* pp. 43-49, for the argument presented here.

[17] Jeffrey, *Contributions,* p. 44.

[18] *Ibid.,* pp. 44-45.

doing anything, have been led very generally to do evil of their own accord. . . . The real and radical difficulty is to find some laudable pursuit that will permanently interest . . . [yet] this, instead of becoming easier in proportion as our intelligence increases, obviously becomes more difficult.[19]

This pessimism led Jeffrey to express a fatalistic attitude and a contempt of elaborate speculative structures. He wrote to Jane Carlyle:

My creed is a very humble and quiescent one on all these matters [eschatalogical ones]—it is to think action and effort no otherwise right than as they are necessary or agreeable; and, seeing in what a vast proportion of things we *must* be *passive*, and submit to be borne on the stream of destiny, to learn to be contented with that lot, and to await patiently for the accidents of enjoyment and illumination which, as well as the contrary, will come to us at any rate, and in spite of our little impatient struggles. . . . Bad heresy this, in the eyes of your man of energy who expects to make discoveries as to these our notions, and to acquire dominion over them. . . .[20]

While the critic discounted speculative opinion, he placed a rather high estimate upon sociability. He wrote to Carlyle:

I do not care a farthing for your opinions, and never imagine that either your speculative errors or mine are much worth enquiring into. But the unsocial dispositions which yours lead you to indulge are a matter of regret to me. . . .[21]

Thomas Carlyle called Francis Jeffrey a materialist. It seems likely that the Scottish sage was thinking in terms of transcendental ethics when he did so. He was probably criticizing Jeffrey's belief that knowledge is possible only in the phenomenal world. Jeffrey, however, attacked not only Berkeley's idealism but also the opposing materialism. He argued against Hobbes's mechanistic theory that thought is motion.[22] His chief objection to materialism is epistemological, for he argued that materialism "makes the faculty of perception a quality of the thing perceived; and converts . . . our knowledge of the qualities of matter into another quality of the same substance."[23] While avoiding the epistemological weakness of the materialist's theory of knowledge, Jeffrey also avoided the epistemological weakness of idealism upon which that philosophy later foundered. Jeffrey exposed the weakness of William Drummond's assertion that the qualities we ascribe to external objects are merely names for our own peculiar sensations (the egocentric predicament of idealism). The critic argued:

Mr. Drummond seems to lay the whole stress of his argument upon a position of Hume's, which he applies himself to vindicate from the objections which Dr. Reid has urged against it. "The table which I see," says Dr. Hume, "diminishes as I remove from it; but the real table suffers no alteration:—it could be nothing but its image, therefore, which was present to my mind." Now this statement, we think, admits pretty explicitly, that there is a real table, the image of which

[19] Jeffrey, *Contributions,* pp. 44-45.
[20] David A. Wilson, *Carlyle to "The French Revolution," 1826-1837* (London, 1924), p. 62.
[21] *Ibid.,* p. 117.
[22] Jeffrey, "Review of Priestly's *Memoirs,*" *Contributions,* p. 496.
[23] *Ibid.,* p. 493.

is presented to the mind: but, at all events, we conceive that the phenomena may be easily reconciled with the supposition of its real existence.[24]

Although knowledge is mediate, our perceptions can be meaningfully related to the external object from which they arise. Thus Jeffrey understood the absurdity of the naïve realist who must argue that the quality of an external object, such as green, is in some sense present in the mind through percipience; and he understood that the idealist can explain our knowing external objects only by expanding the human mind to include all reality and thus reducing objects to phantasms within that enlarged mentality. Jeffrey adhered to a dualistic realism very different from the epistemological views characteristic of most of his contemporaries.

Finally, it must always be remembered that Jeffrey accepted David Hume's theory of morals, which, he said, "we conceive to be both salutary and true."[25] The critic's predilection for empiricism is evident in this passage:

Our feelings of approbation and disapprobation, and the moral distinctions which are raised upon them, are *Facts* which no theory can alter, although it may fail to explain. While these facts remain, they must regulate the conduct, and affect the happiness of mankind, whether they are well or ill accounted for by the theories of philosophers.[26]

To summarize, we note that Francis Jeffrey possessed an eclectic philosophy differing in many respects from the prevailing philosophies of his own day. The critic was an empiricist, accepting the validity of phenomenal knowledge constructed by the Baconian method of induction, and accepting David Hume's view of the probability of human knowledge and his empirical view of human ethics. Furthermore, the critic opposed contemporary materialism and idealism on the epistemological grounds of dualistic realism which later refuted those philosophies. A skeptic in the Humean tradition, he rejected metaphysics as the product of mere introspective speculation and argued that the only value of such mental structures is in the pleasure of using the intellect. He was a pessimist, denying that man was perfectible in the moral realm; he saw human history as a sorrowful record of man's gratification of his egoism and pleasure at the expense of the pain of his fellow men. He accepted almost completely Archibald Alison's aesthetic teachings; but he did so on empirical grounds, and he never used aesthetics as an avenue to hypostatized realms of the spirit.

In the review of Robert Southey's *Thalaba, the Destroyer,* Jeffrey singled out the social views of the Lake poets.[27] The critic considered these views characteristic of the group: general discontent with the existing order of society; brooding over the disorder of man's prog-

[24] Jeffrey, "Review of Priestly's *Memoirs," Contributions,* p. 501.
[25] *Ibid.,* pp. 503-04.
[26] *Idem.*
[27] Jeffrey, "Thalaba, the Destroyer," *Edinburgh Review,* I (October, 1802), 63-83.

ress; acute horror at war and other human vice; abolition of punishment for criminal and legal offenses; excusing the criminal poor on grounds of their moral necessity while showing no mercy to the criminal rich.[28] The critic opposed these principles on what he considered good evidence, and not out of whim or maliciousness as the Lake poets and their circle of friends asserted. The poet who bewails the disorder of man's progress can have no reason to hope that such sorrowing will touch the heart of the critic who honestly believes that man is not perfectible. Poetry which advocates the abolition of legal and penal systems is not likely to evoke beauty in the heart of the critic who is a brilliant and successful lawyer. Jeffrey knew that the legal system of his day was archaic and severe, and much in need of reform. He often defended those who could not pay for counsel, and later as a judge he tempered the harshness of the laws with mercy.[29] The critic as well as the Lake poets was not content with the existing order of society. For over half a century he was active in Whig politics and in public education to effect various reforms. As Lord Advocate he made political history by doing his best to appoint to the many positions under his control the candidates best fitted for them.[30] To such a man, busy with the everyday problems of practical reform, the protests of the poet may seem understandably foolish and hence unpoetic.

The critic was never able to conceive of Wordsworth's treatment of external nature as genuinely realistic. Against the Wordsworthian pseudorealism he placed the realism of George Crabbe. This, of course, is consistent with the critic's philosophy, and he remained true to his viewpoint during the forty-two years from the first number of the *Edinburgh Review* to the publication of his collected periodical essays. The critic likened Crabbe's portraits of English villagers to the work of the Dutch masters, and he made his position clear once and for all in a review of Crabbe's *Poems* of 1807. He said:

> Mr. Crabbe exhibits the common people of England pretty much as they are, and as they must appear to every one who will take the trouble of examining into their condition; at the same time that he renders his sketches in a very high degree interesting and beautiful—by selecting what is most fit for description—by grouping them into such forms as must catch the attention or awake the memory—and by scattering over the whole such traits of moral sensibility, of sarcasm, and of deep reflection, as every one must feel to be natural, and own to be powerful. The gentlemen of the new school, on the other hand, scarcely ever condescend to take their subjects from any description of persons as are known to the common inhabitants of the world; but invent for themselves certain whimsical and unheard-of beings to whom they impute some fantastical combination of feelings, and then labour to excite our sympathy for them, by placing them in incredible situations, or by some strained and exaggerated moralisation of a vague and tragical description.[31]

[28] Jeffrey, in *Edinburgh Review,* I, 63-83.
[29] Henry Cockburn, *Life of Lord Jeffrey* (Philadelphia, 1852), I, 190-91.
[30] D. A. Wilson, *op. cit.,* p. 350.
[31] Jeffrey, *Contributions,* p. 381.

The critic cites from *Matthew,* one Lucy poem (*Strange Fits of Passion Have I Known*), and *The Thorn* to illustrate his assertion that Wordsworth's treatment of subjects is often singular and affected.

Jeffrey's vigorous use of the sword and shield of David Hume against the Acrasia of speculative error is apparent in his attitude towards many "philosophical" passages of *The Excursion.* The following is typical of what the critic called the poet's "raving fits" and of his attitude towards such passages. This is from the account of the Pedlar's early life, Book I, lines 263 ff.:

> . . . and I have heard him say
> That often, failing at this time to gain
> The peace requir'd, he scann'd the laws of light
> Amid the roar of torrents, where they send
> From hollow clefts up to the clearer air
> A cloud of mist, which in the sunshine frames
> A lasting tablet—for the observer's eye
> Varying its rainbow hues.

"The whole book, indeed," says the critic, "is full of such stuff."[32]

In defense of skepticism Hume gave these lines to Philo:

> How do you Mystics, who maintain the absolute incomprehensibility of the Deity, differ from the Skeptics or Atheists who assert, that the first cause of all is unknown and unintelligible? . . . No absurdity ought ever to be assented to with regard to any subject. A total suspense of judgment is here our only resource. . . . Every attack, as is commonly observed, and no defense, among theologians, is successful.[33]

Philo, moreover, agrees with "the poets, who speak from sentiment, without a system," that misery is the human portion.[34] As we have seen, Francis Jeffrey is in thorough agreement with these attitudes and ideas. Here is his skepticism at work in his critical attitude towards William Wordsworth:

> The Ninth [book of *The Excursion*] . . . is chiefly occupied with a mystical discourse of the Pedlar; who maintains, that the whole universe is animated by an active principle, the noblest seat of which is in the human soul; and moreover, that the final end of old age is to train and enable us
>
> "To hear the mighty stream of Tendency
> Uttering, for elevation of our thought,
> A clear sonorous voice, inaudible
> To the vast multitude whose doom it is
> To run the giddy round of vain delight."
>
> with other matters as luminous and emphatic.[35]

The critic could laugh at such mysticism (his favorite name for the material of such passages) when it appeared occasionally, but he found the *White Doe of Rylstone* so permeated with "such stuff" that,

[32] Jeffrey, *Contributions,* p. 463.
[33] David Hume, *Selections,* ed. Charles Hendel (New York, 1927), pp. 320, 352.
[34] *Ibid.,* p. 359.
[35] Jeffrey, *Contributions,* p. 461.

losing patience and temper, he wrote ill-naturedly. Nevertheless, the refusal to take such poetizing seriously in Wordsworth's later poem, reviewed in October, 1815, is motivated by the same opinions that the critic expressed in his review of *Thalaba* in 1802. Of the earliest production of the Lake poets, *Lyrical Ballads,* Jeffrey had a high opinion.[36] Nevertheless, he had believed then that the merits of these poems were a strong spirit of originality, pathos, and natural feeling; yet he had seen evidence of affectation and singularity which might grow upon the Lake poets and thus vitiate later works. The *White Doe,* it seemed to Jeffrey, confirmed his earlier fears:

> . . . it seems to us to consist of a happy union of all the faults, without any of the beauties, which belong to his school of poetry.[37]

Although many characteristics of Wordsworth's poetry provoked Jeffrey's opposition, a few qualities aroused his admiration. Even in *The Excursion* the Scotsman found beauties to enjoy. He liked the story of the weaver's deserted wife (Book I, lines 502 ff.), the story of the old chaplain (Book III), the sad narratives of Ellen, various descriptions which treated nature with clear-eyed vision rather than with the spectacles of "mysticism," such as the one of the mountain ash (Book VII, lines 717 ff.), and such pessimistic utterances as

> . . . Earth is sick,
> And Heav'n is weary of the hollow words
> Which States and Kingdom utter when they speak
> Of Truth and Justice. (Book V, lines 378-81.)

This passage obviously appealed to the critic because the thought and tones are so close to his own in his essay on Mme de Staël. He always enjoyed poetic treatment of natural scenes, so long as they were presented faithfully and without oddity, and he expressed this opinion in essays on Robert Burns and Thomas Campbell.[38] He liked the stories of the weaver's wife, of the old chaplain, and of Ellen because of their direct simplicity and domestic pathos. These were qualities he admired in George Crabbe, Samuel Rogers, and Thomas Campbell.[39]

In conclusion, it is now clear that Francis Jeffrey is not a Platonist, that his criticism does not suffer from various inconsistencies, that in fact he has a definite set of critical principles created out of his philosophical skepticism and positivism, his adherence to the moral theory of David Hume, and his reliance upon the aesthetics of Archibald Alison to explain on empirical grounds the way in which an individual

---

[36] Jeffrey, "Poems in Two Volumes by William Wordsworth," *Edinburgh Review,* XI (October, 1807), 214-15.

[37] Jeffrey, *Contributions,* p. 469.

[38] Jeffrey, "Reliques of Burns . . . by R. H. Cromek," *Edinburgh Review,* XIII (January, 1809), 276; *ibid.,* XIV (April, 1809), 1-19.

[39] Jeffrey, "Human Life: A Poem by Samuel Rogers," *Edinburgh Review,* XXXI (March, 1819), 325-36. Essays on Crabbe and Campbell have already been cited.

creates beauty in response to objects of art. As the metaphysical structures scorned by the Scotch critic gained disciples until even Edinburgh, the stronghold of the Scottish common-sense philosophy, gave way to the Neo-Kantians and the Neo-Hegelians, the skeptics, who did not have the coherence of a "school," fell into disrepute. Romanticism and idealism flourished while the ideas in which Francis Jeffrey believed were condemned as "naturalistic," "brutish," and lacking in "spirituality." Perhaps the wide acceptance of various realisms in philosophy and literature today has made it possible to read the essays of Francis Jeffrey more nearly in the spirit in which they were written and with understanding of the attitudes and values which this critic defended.

University of California, Davis

DR. JOHNSON AT FORT AUGUSTUS: CAPTAIN LEWIS OURRY

By DONALD CORNU

For a century and a half—from 1785 to 1936—one of Johnson's entertaining breakfast companions at Fort Augustus in Scotland has been recorded as a Captain "Urie" who had "served in America." Professors Pottle and Bennett in their noteworthy edition of Boswell's *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL.D.*[1] (printed for the first time from the original manuscript, where the name is "Urie") corrected the spelling to "Ourry" and in their index listed him as Captain Lewis Ourry. Professor Pottle informs me that they had their information from the *Army List* for 1773. Dr. L. F. Powell in his forthcoming revision of Hill's edition of the *Tour* also has correctly identified the captain and will print in an appendix Ourry's military record as it was given him by Mr. A. S. White of the War Office. Dr. Powell has very kindly consented to my reproducing it here:

2nd Lieut., Churchill's Marines, 22 June 1747; Fort Adjutant, Jersey, 20 Mar. 1750; Lieut., 60th Regiment, 14 Jan. 1756; Captain Lieut., do., 29 Aug. 1759; Captain, do., 12 Dec. 1760; Captain, 15th Regiment, 15 July 1772; Retired 1 Dec. 1775.[2]

Boswell probably spelled the name as he heard it. *Urie* is a well-known Scottish name denoting a barony, an island, a river, and a lake. No doubt this accident of orthography explains why readers thus far have failed to associate Johnson's acquaintance, Captain "Urie," with the distinguished officer of a colonial war whose name had been honorably recorded in printed history eight years before Johnson and Boswell met him.

To Captain Ourry's industry, intelligence, and, perhaps most of all, to his sense of humor may fairly be credited much of the success of Colonel Henry Bouquet's operations against the Indians in western Pennsylvania and the Ohio country during the Pontiac Conspiracy.

[1] New York: Viking Press, 1936. Hereafter references to this work will be noted as *Journal*. References to Johnson's *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland* and to Boswell's *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* (the time-honored text, first published in 1785) will be noted simply as *Journey* and *Tour*, respectively, and will be from R. W. Chapman's editions, both in one volume (London, 1930).

[2] This entry will appear on page 513 of Appendix D of this eagerly awaited "fifth volume" which has long been in proof. Professors Pottle and Bennett had proof-sheets of Dr. Powell's edition during the final steps in the publication of the *Journal*, and Professor Pottle was good enough to make a copy for me of the entry which gives the record of Captain Ourry.

As commanding officer of Fort Bedford and as Bouquet's Quarter Master General and closest friend, Ourry held a key position in those campaigns. He was loaded with responsibilities few officers of his rank have had to carry, and under them he was able to maintain an equanimity and a kind of amused detachment that one cannot help but admire. His personality appears to have impressed itself on everyone with whom he had dealings, from the poorest settler to the Commander in Chief, General Amherst. Cowards, timeservers, thieves, landgrabbers, and shysters—whether civilians or men in uniform—feared him with good reason. There were many, however, who eagerly sought his company, and he was respected by all.

Those in the armed forces today who complain about the burden of paper work should read Captain Ourry's letters, nearly three hundred of which have been preserved.[3] Their production, with a quill pen and most often by candlelight, was itself no small off-duty achievement. As might be expected, they are of great historical value; remarkable is the fact that they are written with a flourish and style rarely found in military correspondence. They are sprinkled with humor, satiric observations, wit—including puns good and bad—and edged comments on many matters not directly connected with the pressing affairs at hand. Ourry, too, was bilingual. Since nearly all of his letters are reports to Colonel Bouquet, a Swiss, it is not surprising that many are in French; passages of a personal or confidential nature in other letters Ourry often puts in that language. Occasionally he amused himself by composing French verses which he forwarded to his friend.

The whole style and tone of Ourry's letters is such that a reader can easily understand why Johnson was entertained by the conversation of their writer. This quality may explain also why the historian Parkman, himself a stylist, chose to quote from them in *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*,[4] and why Hervey Allen introduced Ourry as a character in his trilogy *The Disinherited*.[5]

On their tour Boswell and Johnson met soldiers of much greater fame than Ourry. Colonel Sir Eyre Coote, their host at Fort George, was soon to become Commander in Chief in India and the conqueror of Hyder Ali. At Loudoun they dined with John Campbell, 4th Earl

[3] In the *Bouquet Papers*, British Museum Additional Manuscripts, Nos. 21631-21660. The Library of Congress has photostats of the entire series, and the Canadian Archives at Ottawa possess a long-hand transcription made in the 1880's. A transcription of 16 of the 30 letterbooks in this series was made by the Pennsylvania Historical Survey (Frontier Forts and Trails Survey, Federal W.P.A.) and published in mimeographed form by the Pennsylvania Historical Commission, Harrisburg, 1940-; it does not include B.M. Add. MSS 21642 in which are to be found 285 letters written by, and 8 letters addressed to, Captain Ourry.

[4] Champlain Edition, 3 vols. (Boston, 1898), II, 176-80.

[5] I, *The Forest and the Fort* (New York, 1943); II, *Bedford Village* (New York, 1944); III, *Toward the Morning* (New York, 1948). Ourry appears in the second and third of these historical novels which are set in western Pennsylvania at the time of the Pontiac Conspiracy (1763-1764).

of Loudoun, who had been Commander in Chief in America from 1756 to 1758 at the same time he was Colonel Commandant of Bouquet's and Ourry's regiment, the 60th or Royal American.[6] Both were hospitable and kind, but I feel sure neither came as near as Ourry to being Johnson's intellectual equal, and consequently neither made so lasting an impression. Certainly no other officer whom Johnson met could have spoken with greater authority than Ourry on the subject of their discussion, the American Indians.

The remainder of this paper will be concerned with an account of the meeting of Johnson and Boswell with Captain Ourry and with a sketch of his military career.

On Monday, August 30, 1773, the travelers, with Boswell's servant, Joseph Ritter, left their chaise at Inverness and began their *equitation*, as Boswell put it, thinking he had coined a word. The Scot's first view of his hero on horseback is reported with an ambiguity that only partly conceals his amusement. They were at last in the Highlands and well started on that journey of which a contemporary wrote that it was "no less classical and . . . far more interesting than that of Horace to Brundusium."[7] It was dark by the time they had skirted Loch Ness and come to Fort Augustus. They had found time, however, to dine at a public house and to inspect a primitive Highland hut and its occupant. "It was a delightful day," wrote Boswell.

The fort, which stood at the southwestern end of the lake, was commanded by Colonel Alexander Trapaud, its Deputy Governor, whom Boswell had met twelve years earlier. Presuming on that slender acquaintance and on his father's reputation, he sent ahead Joseph and one of their guides with a card to inform the Governor that Dr. Johnson and he were "coming up, leaving it to him to invite us or not."[8]

As usual, Boswell is completely transparent; he is eager to spend the night with the garrison. Two days earlier he and Johnson had enjoyed greatly their few hours at Fort George near Inverness, where

---

[6] Boswell mentions the ingratitude which Loudoun had met with "from persons both in high and low rank" but is himself completely won over to him. "While I live, I shall honour the memory of this amiable man." *Journal*, p. 366. Compare Benjamin Franklin: "On the whole I then wonder'd much, how such a man came to be entrusted with so important a Business as the Conduct of a great Army; but having since seen more of the great World, and the means of obtaining & Motives for giving Places and employments, my Wonder is diminished. . . . [Loudoun's campaign of 1757] was frivolous, expensive and disgraceful to our Nation beyond Conception." *Benjamin Franklin's Memoirs*, Parallel text edition edited by Max Farrand (Berkeley, 1949), p. 400. A Philadelphian named Innis is supposed to have said of Loudoun that he was "like King George upon the sign posts, always on horseback but never advancing." Loudoun was succeeded in command by Amherst.

[7] Anonymous review of Johnson's *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland* in *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. 45 (1775), p. 35.

[8] *Journal*, p. 101. Compare Johnson: "Mr. Boswell, who between his father's merit and his own, is sure of reception wherever he comes, sent a servant before to beg admission and entertainment for that night." *Journey*, pp. 29-30.

they had been shown around and taken "to wait on Sir Eyre Coote," commanding the 37th Regiment of Foot then stationed there.[9] Sir Eyre invited them to dine with him.

> At three the drum beat for dinner. I could for a little fancy myself a military man, and it pleased me. We went to Sir Eyre's, in the Governor's house, and found him a most gentlemanlike man. His lady was, though not a beauty, one of the most agreeable women I ever saw. . . . She had a young lady, a companion with her. There was a pretty large company. . . . We had a dinner of two complete courses, a variety of wines, and the regimental band of music playing in the square before the windows after it. I enjoyed this day very much. We were quite easy and cheerful. Mr. Johnson said, "I shall always remember this fort with gratitude."[10]

Civilians, it may be remarked, are frequently disarmed by military hospitality. Johnson had always a very friendly feeling toward the army, and the garrison at Fort George was the first he had ever seen.[11] As for Boswell, there is plenty of evidence that he, like Walter Mitty, frequently indulged in reveries of heroic enterprise.[12] Understandably then, Boswell was doing his best to arrange another pleasant break in their journey, this time at Fort Augustus; besides, he carefully explains, the public inn was "wretched." "Government ought to build one, or give the Governor an additional salary, as he must necessarily be put to a great expense in entertaining travellers."[13] His concern for Colonel Trapaud's personal budget was fully eclipsed, we may be sure, by his joy in their kind reception.

> Joseph announced to us when we lighted that the Governor waited for us at the gate. We walked towards it. He met us, and with much civility conducted us to his house. It was comfortable to find ourselves in a well-built little square, a neat well-furnished house with prints, etc., a good supper (fricasee of moorfowl, etc.); in short, with all the conveniences of civilized life in the midst of rude mountains. Mrs. Trapaud and the Governor's daughter and her husband, Captain Newmarsh, were all most obliging and polite. The Governor, though near seventy, had excellent animal spirits, the conversation of a soldier and somewhat of a Frenchman, talking with importance of everything, however small. We passed a very agreeable evening till twelve, and then went to bed.[14]

[9] Coote took command on March 13 that same year "in the room of Lieut.-Gen. Sir George Gray, deceased." *Annual Register for 1773*, p. 163.

[10] *Journal*, pp. 92, 94.

[11] *Journey*, p. 23; for Johnson's attitudes toward the army and war, see the article by the late Captain H. R. Kilbourne, "Dr. Johnson and War," *ELH*, XII (1945), 130-43.

[12] For example, the following month, at Sir Allan McLean's, Boswell slept on a camp-bed that had belonged to Lieutenant Colonel Roger Townsend who was killed at Ticonderoga in 1759. "There was something curious in sleeping in a camp-bed which had actually been in service in America. My old soldierly inclinations revived." *Journal*, p. 318.

[13] Colonel Trapaud, Deputy Governor, received as pay £300 per annum. Lieutenant General Studholme Hodgson was Governor of both Fort George and Fort Augustus with annual pay of £500 for his responsibilities at the former post. For Fort Augustus his gubernatorial pay is listed as £0-0-0. *A List of the Officers in the Several Regiments . . . Governors, &c of His Majesty's Garrisons . . . London, 1773.*

[14] *Journal*, pp. 101-02. There are slight differences between the *Journal* and the text that Boswell printed; e.g., "The Governor had excellent animal spirits, the

The night which followed was, at least for Johnson, as memorable as the day. Five years later he wrote to Boswell: "The best night I have had these twenty years was at Fort Augustus."[15] On another occasion he noted, this time in his prayer-book, a night spent in "sweet uninterrupted sleep" such as he had not known since he "slept at Fort Augustus."[16] The thirty or so miles covered that first day on horseback sufficiently account for his blissful slumber without reckoning the mountain air and the "fricasee of moor-fowl, etc."

TUESDAY 31 AUGUST: The Governor has a very neat garden. We looked at it and all the rest of the fort, which is but small and may be commanded from a variety of hills around. We also looked at the galley or sloop belonging to the fort, which sails upon the Loch and brings what is wanted for the garrison. Captains Ourry and D'Aripé and Lieutenant Letch breakfasted with us. The two former had been in the American War, and entertained Mr. Johnson much with accounts of the Indians. He said he could make a very pretty book out of them were he to stay there. . . .[17]

---

conversation of a soldier, and somewhat of a Frenchman, to which his extraction entitles him. He is brother to General Cyrus Trapaud." *Tour,* p. 245.

Colonel Trapaud had a long tour of duty as Deputy Governor, his original appointment being dated June 26, 1753. *Gentleman's Magazine,* Vol. 23 (1753), p. 297. Mrs. Trapaud, hostess to Johnson and Boswell, died on May 24 the following year. *Ibid.,* Vol. 44 (1774), p. 287. Colonel Trapaud, "though near seventy," remarried; in 1798 is noted the death of his "widow" at Inverness. *Ibid.,* Vol. 68 (1798), p. 358; see also note 17, *infra.*

[15] *Boswell's Life of Johnson,* edited by G. B. Hill, revised and enlarged edition by L. F. Powell, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1934), III, 369.

[16] *Ibid.,* III, 99 n.

[17] *Journal,* p. 102. *Tour,* p. 245, reads: "Captains Urie and Darippe of the 15th regiment of foot, breakfasted with us. They had served in America, and entertained Dr. Johnson much with an account of the Indians. He said, he could make a very pretty book out of them, were he to stay there."

Johnson himself says very little about this stop in the Highlands. He mentions Colonel Trapaud's courtesy ("that courtesy which is so closely connected with the military character"), the situation of the fort ("well chosen for pleasure"), the sloop, and "how kindly [they] had been treated at the garrison," but does not mention the officers with whom they breakfasted. *Journey,* pp. 30-31. In his letter to Mrs. Thrale, dated September 6, 1773, and written from Skye, Johnson said of Fort Augustus "we were well entertained and well lodged, and next morning, after having viewed the fort, we pursued our journey." *Letters of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.,* collected and edited by G. B. Hill, 2 vols. (New York, 1892), I, 242.

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Powell for calling my attention to the writings of Mrs. Anne Grant, in which Captain Ourry is mentioned and in which his sister Anne appears frequently. Mrs. Grant's father, Duncan Macvicar, became barrack-master at Fort Augustus in 1773, and she lived there from May of that year until her marriage in 1779. The following description of the fort is in her letter of June 15, 1773, to a Miss Reid:

"The fort stands on the brink of the lake, near the centre, and the Oich and Tarffe discharge their pure streams into it on each side. Next the lake the Governor has created a most picturesque shrubbery and garden in the dry ditch that surrounds the fort, and has covered the wall with fruit trees, and hid the masked battery with laurels. That beautiful spot the glacis, is almost an island: the village looks down on it from the west; on the north and south it is inclosed by the Tarffe and Oich, a bridge crossing each, parallel with the fort; on the east, Loch Ness forms a noble boundary, with its pier and solitary vessel, which the vastness of the surrounding objects diminishes to a toy. The fort too appears the prettiest little thing you can imagine. You would suppose some old veteran had built himself a house with a ditch and drawbridge, to remind him of his

One can infer that the breakfast was long drawn-out, for the next event which Boswell records is the Governor's request that they stay for dinner. They regretted, and rode forth "between twelve and one" toward the western coast and further experiences.

Would the "very pretty book" have been written about the two officers and their adventures or about the Indians? Boswell's "them" is uncertain in reference. In either case, one may be sure that it would have contained the names of persons and places familiar to all, especially to Americans: Wolfe and Quebec; Forts Pitt and Detroit; Senecas, Delawares, and Shawnees; Chief Pontiac, and Generals Forbes, Amherst, and Gage. Everyone can wish that it had been written; Americans, of course, would prefer to have had it completed before 1775.

Thus does Lewis Ourry appear momentarily on the Johnsonian scene. So far as I have been able to discover, he is not named again by either Boswell or Johnson, although Boswell referred to him indirectly in conversation later that same day,[18] and years afterward Johnson mentioned an incident in America about which they had been told by "an officer at Fort Augustus, who had served in America."[19] Here, then, at an obscure post in Scotland we find Captain Lewis Ourry near the end of his active duty. Nine years of a far from sedentary life in the American colonies, with their varied and challenging associations—military, social, and commercial—could only make his service at Fort Augustus a deadening anticlimax. Undoubtedly he found Johnson and Boswell as interesting as they found him, for he delighted in stimulating conversation, and there is no reason to think that it could often be found in that garrison in the Highlands. One could wish that we had his description of the overnight visitors of 1773.

I have not been able to discover the places or dates of Ourry's birth and death. His was, I think, a Jersey family, certainly French in

---

past exploits. I have not been in it yet, but the barracks form the walls, and they are so white and clean-looking, and the bastions so green and rural, and it is so fancifully planted round with the mountain-ash, you would think Vertumnus commanded here, and had garrisoned the fort with Dryads. The lake, which opens in a long vista below, reflects this fairy fortress." *Letters from the Mountains, being the real Correspondence of a Lady between the Years 1773 and 1807*, 3 vols., 2nd edition (London, 1807), I, 144-45.

While Anne Macvicar was, in all probability, present at Fort Augustus when Johnson and Boswell stopped there, she does not refer to their visit in her *Letters.* One does find in them, however, an amusing description of Captain D'Aripé ("Fungy"), "who of all things dreaded female pedants," and an account of Lieutenant Letch's unhappy career. (I, 178, 179, 185.) She also gives, in passing, considerable information about the "Governor," his second wife (1778—"new espoused love"), his daughter, and her husband, Captain Newmarsh.

[18] "I had talked of the officers whom we had left today: how much service they had seen and how little they got for it, even of fame. Mr. Johnson said, 'Sir, a soldier gets as little as any man can get.'" *Journal*, p. 104.

[19] *Life of Johnson*, III, 246. I hope soon to publish evidence that this one officer was Captain Ourry.

origin.[20] We know that Ourry was commissioned a 2nd Lieutenant in Churchill's Marines in 1747, and Fort Adjutant at Jersey in 1750. He first achieves personality in nineteen letters addressed to him at Jersey between February, 1754, and July, 1755, by two brothers and a sister-in-law, the wife of a third brother. These letters, strangely enough, are included in one of Colonel Henry Bouquet's letterbooks and must have been carried by Ourry to America.[21]

One can infer from them that Lewis Ourry, while Fort Adjutant, lived with or near his father (a lieutenant in the Independent Company at Jersey) and his sisters.[22] He was married, and the father of two or more girls. One brother wrote, "Embrace your spouse for me, and my little neices"; and again, "P.S. My love to your little ones." Another brother, after special mention of their father and sisters, sent love "for yourself & familly." Such are the meager details concerning his domestic situation.

About Ourry's three brothers, all in the Navy, there is much more information. In 1754-1755, Isaac Florimond was a lieutenant, engaged at London and Greenwich in pressing for H.M.S. *Lichfield,* then fitting out;[23] George, in the *Unicorn,* had been for nine months the only lieutenant in that ship and was daily expecting his commission; Paul Henry was a lieutenant in the *Deptford* at Gibraltar and Port Mahon, and had recently fought a duel to the great distress of his wife.[24]

[20] Mrs. Anne Grant, who knew the Ourrys intimately, wrote that "the ancestors of this lady [Anne Ourry, the Captain's sister] . . . left France, for conscience sake, on the repeal of the Edict of Nantz. . . ." *Letters from the Mountains,* II, 254.

[21] B.M. Add. MSS 21643. The writers are Isaac Florimond Ourry, George Ourry, and Charity ("Cherry"), wife of Paul Henry Ourry. The three tell much about their own situations.

[22] Mentioned are Anne (Nancy), and Madelon. Anne Ourry was Mrs. Grant of Laggan's dearest friend (see note 17, *supra*), and many of her *Letters from the Mountains* are addressed to "My ever dear Nancy" or "My dearest Anne."

[23] B.M. Add. MSS 21643. Isaac Ourry's letter of February 9, 1754, refers to "this most unpolitical & dangerous duty," and "D----d duty." One of February 28, 1755, written from The Hoop and Horseshoe, Little Tower Hill, describes a pathetic scene of "pressing."

[24] The three brothers had naval careers of considerable distinction.

(A) Isaac F. Ourry died at Madras in 1774 while in command of H.M.S. *Buckingham. Gentleman's Magazine,* Vol. 44 (1774), p. 190. His widow died at Laleham in 1786. *Ibid.,* Vol. 56 (1786), p. 1094.

(B) George Ourry was commissioned captain November 10, 1763, and participated in the British capture of Manila. Colonel Bouquet to Captain Lewis Ourry, June 9, 1763: "I give you joy at the Success of our Troops at Manila where Captain George Ourry hath acquired the two best things in this world, Glory & Money." B.M. Add. MSS 21634. He commanded the *Somerset* at the time of the British naval attack of November 15, 1777, on Fort Mifflin in the Delaware. She was a ship of 64 guns and 500 men. "Letter of John Laurens, November 1777," *Pennsylvania Magazine of Biography and History,* Vol. 65 (1941), pp. 353-62. The *Somerset* was wrecked off Cape Cod in 1778, and Captain Ourry subsequently commissioned the *Ocean. Private papers of John, Earl of Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1771-1782,* edited by G. R. Barnes and J. H. Owen, 4 vols. (Navy Records Society, 1932-1938), III, 64 n.

(C) Paul Henry Ourry was a captain of February 3, 1757. *Ibid.* He commanded the frigate *Success* in the expedition against Louisburg, and later the

Lewis Ourry, it would seem, was not satisfied with his duty at Jersey. Perhaps he was jealous of his brothers, who certainly were seeing more of the world than he. At any rate it is plain that he had expressed his discontent to them. Isaac wrote him from Mount Edgecumbe on October 18, 1754:

> I don't doupt but the news of two regiments going to Virginia has made you cock your Ears. I have thought of you many times since y^e^ first reports, but believe me it is such an expedition as few go to by choice & which will be attended with many ill-conveniences & little or no profit to y^e^ bold adventurers.

In the light of the fate which overtook Braddock's expedition, this is a prophetic understatement. In April, 1755, Isaac wrote about the steps he was taking to help Lewis purchase a company of marines, but warned him not to resign the commission he then held until he could be certain that no slip might occur. Lewis evidently continued his wirepulling, for on January 14, 1756, he was commissioned a lieutenant in the 62nd Regiment of Foot, and with that regiment (under its later designation, the 60th, or Royal American) he served for the next nine years.

Parliament on November 13, 1755, authorized the raising of a regiment of foot in North America (29 George II, cap. 5). On December 25 it was organized on paper, designated the "62nd, or Royal American Regiment of Foot," and given to the Earl of Loudoun. With the disbanding of the 50th and 51st in 1756, the 62nd became the 60th, and such it remained until 1881 when it became The King's Royal Rifle Corps. This famous regiment possesses no "colours," although it bears—or did in 1901—more "honours" than any other British regiment.[25]

Actæon at Quiberon Bay under Admiral Hawke. In 1762 he was in the West Indies under Rodney. Captain John Knox, *An Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America for the Years 1757, 1758, 1759, and 1760,* edited with Introduction and Index by Arthur G. Doughty, 3 vols. (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1914-1916), I, 45 and note. Ourry in 1780 was one of "14 Knights and gentlemen" named to be "his Majesty's Commissioners, in quality of principal officers of his Majesty's Navy" (*Annual Register for 1780,* p. 249), and was Commissioner of the Dock Yard at Plymouth for several years. Four letters addressed by him to the First Lord during the flurry caused by the appearance of French and Spanish fleet units off Plymouth in August, 1779, are printed in *Private Papers of John, Earl of Sandwich,* III, 64, 73, 78, 84. In 1762 he was elected to Parliament for Plympton in place of his brother-in-law, George Hele Treby, deceased. *Gentleman's Magazine,* Vol. 33 (1763), p. 620. His widow, Charity Treby Ourry, died in 1805, aged 78, at the home of her daughter, Lady Molesworth, in Grosvenor Square. *Ibid.,* Vol. 75, Part II (1805), p. 1078. Some idea of his age may be gained from his statement in a letter to Colonel George Russell, written at Gibraltar in June, 1754, that he then had had twenty-four years "of service constantly on board his Majesty's ships." *Frankland-Russell-Astley Papers,* Historical Manuscripts Commission (London, 1900), p. 412.

I believe Paul Henry to have been the eldest, and Lewis the youngest, of the four brothers. The tone and the amount of advice in the letters of Isaac and George to Lewis are distinctly elder brotherish.

[25] John S. Farmer, *The Regimental Records of the British Army* (London, 1901), p. 180. See also Lewis Butler and Sir Steuart Hare, *The Annals of the King's Royal Rifle Corps,* 5 vols. and Appendix vol. by Major General Astley Terry (London, 1913-1932).

From Whitehall came the following announcement on March 20, 1756:

The King has been pleased to appoint the following lord and gentlemen to be officers to the 62nd or Royal American Reg. of foot to be forthwith raised in America.

Col. in Chief. Rt. Hon. Earl of Loudoun.
Col. Commandants. John Stanwix, Joseph Dusseaux, and James Prevost, Esqrs.
Lieut. Colonels. Henry Bouquet, Fred. Haldimand, Russel Chapman, Esqrs., and Sir John StClair, Bart.
Majors. John Young, James Robertson, John Rutherford and Augustine Prevost, Esqrs.
Captains. [27 are named.]
Capt. Lieutenants. [4 are named.][26]

The long list of lieutenants, which would have included the name of Lewis Ourry, is not given. By special provision aliens to a maximum of fifty in number, "being protestants," might be commissioned in the Royal American, because the plan called for recruiting the regiment largely from non-English-speaking settlers, and linguistic qualifications were important. Although no alien, Ourry may have owed his commission in the 60th to his proficiency in French.

Some time in 1756 the officers of the 60th arrived in America, and began the task of recruiting, organizing, and training. The regiment was set up with four battalions of one thousand men each, and consequently at full strength would be several times the size of the average regiment of foot. The first battalion, commanded by Bouquet, was located at Philadelphia until the middle of 1757, when it moved to Charleston, South Carolina.

From the beginning Bouquet had difficulties with the provincial and town authorities, who were worse than backward in providing the British troops with the billets, barracks, hospital space, etc., they had agreed to furnish. The first document bearing the signature of Lewis Ourry which I have found is dated at Philadelphia, December 24, 1756, and headed "Return of the Beds in the Following Houses." It names thirty-eight householders; their accommodations ("beds") are checked under two columns: "Wanting" and "Bad." A recapitulation has "36 wanting" and "47 bad." Ourry here describes himself "Acting as Qr^{t} Mas^{tr} to the first Batt. of the Royal American Regiment."[27] This bed-check was used by Bouquet in support of one of his many complaints to the civilian officials.

After spending almost a year in South Carolina, the First Battalion was moved in the late spring of 1758 back to Pennsylvania, where it

[26] *Gentleman's Magazine,* Vol. 26 (1756), p. 151. Stanwix became a lieutenant general in 1761, and was lost in the Irish Channel in 1766. Sir Frederick Haldimand (1718-1791) was a Swiss, like his friend Bouquet; after distinguished service at Ticonderoga, Montreal, etc., he attained the rank of lieutenant general and was Governor General of Canada from 1778 to 1785.

[27] *Pennsylvania Archives,* Vol. 3 (Philadelphia, 1853), p. 85.

operated for the next six years. Bouquet, who had been promoted to "Colonel in America" (January, 1758), was second in command to Brigadier General John Forbes on the expedition of that year against Fort DuQuesne. There was much discussion of the best choice of routes to the west. Colonel Washington, who represented Virginia and, according to Forbes, Virginian interests rather than strictly military ones, strongly favored the Cumberland Road which Braddock had taken. Forbes, and we may suppose many Pennsylvanians, too, wanted the road to run west from Carlisle through southern Pennsylvania. In this controversy Bouquet carried on much of the negotiation with Washington; Pennsylvania won out, and the Forbes Road was settled upon. This was the route used in 1758 by the expedition which forced the evacuation of Fort DuQuesne by the French. That fort, immediately occupied by the British, was named for Pitt and became the western strong point against the French and Indians, and the supporting base for the lesser frontier posts at Presqu'Isle (now Erie), LeBoeuf, and Venango.[28] After the death of Forbes at Philadelphia in 1759, Bouquet succeeded to the command of all forces, both British and Provincial, in Pennsylvania and on its frontier, an area designated "The Southern Department."

It was Bouquet's Herculean task to improve and maintain the Forbes Road; to build and garrison forts along that road; to man and support the frontier outposts; to purchase all the supplies for his troops; to hire men, horses, and wagons to transport those supplies in a steady flow to the west; to maintain communications throughout his Department; to obtain intelligence of Indian activities and negotiate with friendly tribes; to persuade the provincial Assemblies to raise men and money in support of their defenses; to keep peace between the Militiamen and the Redcoats; to evolve new tactics for Indian warfare and train his troops in their use; to control the settlers and traders who were swarming westward (for there was no civil authority on the frontier); and—this last must at times have seemed merely incidental to Bouquet—to defend the colonists from their enemies, the French and the Indians.

He personally commanded the little army of five hundred men which marched from Carlisle in the summer of 1763 to relieve the closely besieged Fort Pitt and which on August 5 and 6 won the battle of Bushy Run, "one of the best-contested actions ever fought between white men and Indians"[29] and a battle which turned the tide against the Pontiac conspirators. The following year he led the force which advanced from Fort Pitt to the heart of the Ohio country and forced

[28] Fort Pitt was located in what is now the heart of the city of Pittsburgh, at the point of the "Golden Triangle" where the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers join to make the Ohio. About all that remains of the original fortifications is a five-sided stone, brick, and wood redoubt of two floors. In a wooden lintel over the doorway of this building is carved "H. Bouquet." A project is afoot to make a thirty-six acre State Park around this only vestige of frontier Pittsburgh.

[29] Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, II, 205.

the Indians finally to capitulate and surrender their white prisoners. For his achievements Bouquet received "Well Done's" from both Amherst and Gage, a vote of commendation from the Pennsylvania Assembly, the formal thanks of King George in General Orders, and promotion to Brigadier General. He was given command of the Southern District, with headquarters at Pensacola, where he died of a fever in the fall of 1765. Bouquet was one of the very great British soldiers.[30]

I have given this space to Colonel Bouquet because the activities of Captain Ourry during the period 1756-1765 paralleled and closely supported those of his commanding officer. And Ourry's duties, if less responsible, were no less arduous than those of the Colonel. The respect they held for one another bred strong loyalty and grew into a warm friendship, well evidenced in their correspondence.

At no time after his arrival in America does Ourry appear to have had duty involving simply the command of a platoon or company. One can surmise that his earlier duty as Fort Adjutant at Jersey had given him the kind of administrative experience that Bouquet most greatly needed. Although Sir John St. Clair was the Deputy Quarter Master General of the Department, Ourry, first as a lieutenant, later as captain lieutenant and captain, was Aide (i.e., Assistant) Deputy Quarter Master General and carried the greater burden of the work of supply, transport, and accounting. Ourry's industry and reliability soon became widely known, and this reputation resulted, of course, in his being given more and more to do. What was thought of him comes out in General Forbes' postscript to a letter to Bouquet:

> P.S. There was a tent and Markee of mine forgot in the stores as likewise a barrell of Hams —Mr. Sinclair promised that they should be sent safe down the country but as I dread his performance be so good as speak to Ourry about them, to whom my compliments.[31]

[30] The first printed account of Bouquet's operations is that by Dr. William Smith, Provost of the College of Philadelphia, *An Historical Account of the Expedition against the Ohio Indians in the Year MDCCLXIV* (Philadelphia, 1765). This work contains an "Introductory Account of the Preceding Campaign and the Battle of Bushy Run," as well as several "Military Papers" (possibly written by Bouquet himself) which are printed as appendices and which deal with the problems of Indian warfare, defenses for frontier settlements, etc. The book was reprinted in London in 1766, and a French translation, with a short biography of Bouquet by C. G. F. Dumas added, appeared at Amsterdam in 1769. A reprint of the London edition of 1766, with an introduction by Parkman and a translation (also by Parkman) of Dumas' biographical sketch, came out in Cincinnati in 1868.

Captain Ourry is mentioned in Smith's book as commanding at Fort Bedford.

Other good, if brief, treatments of Bouquet's career are the following: Lieutenant General Sir Edward Hutton, *Colonel Bouquet, 60th Royal Americans, 1756-1765* (Winchester [England], 1911), 40 pp.; Edward E. Robbins, "Life and Services of Colonel Henry Bouquet," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine*, III (1920), 120-39; E. Douglas Branch, "Henry Bouquet: Professional Soldier," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 62 (1938), pp. 41-51.

[31] "The Halt, January 14, 1759," B.M. Add. MSS 21640. This letter is printed in *Writings of General John Forbes Relating to his Service in North America*, compiled and edited by Alfred Proctor James (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1938), pp. 279-80.

Ourry's versatility is, perhaps, nowhere better shown than in his own listing of his duties in 1762. In command then at Fort Bedford and exasperated by "les Ivrognes, les Cocus, les Putains, les Paillards, les Voleurs, les Frondeurs—bref, toute la Canaille de la Communication" with whom he had to deal, he blew off steam in his half-jesting reference to "le poids de toutes mes honorable et deshonorable Fonctions—Governeur, Facteur—Ingé[nieur], Excise Man—Magistrate, Clerck—Contracteur, Commissaire—A. D. Q. M. G. H. I. K. L. M. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c."[32]

During most of the year 1758 Ourry worked at Philadelphia, Carlisle, and Fort Loudoun on the problems of supply and transport. By December, however, he was established at the newly erected Fort Bedford, located at the little settlement known then as Rays Town, about equidistant from Carlisle, the main base of operations, and Fort Pitt. For the next five years he served continuously at Bedford (today an attractive resort town), with only occasional and brief trips abroad on military business. A few times he traveled to Philadelphia, and once to New York, for the purpose of having his accounts audited and settled.

As early as June 1, 1759, Bouquet had written to Ourry that "the Dismal Circumstances of the Advanced posts renders your presence Necessary at Bedford,"[33] and soon thereafter he was given command of that important point on the route to Fort Pitt.[34] Two hundred and fifty of Ourry's letters now in the British Museum were written from Fort Bedford, and taken together they give what is almost a day-to-day account of the happenings at that extremely busy place. "Si notre Epée, malgre nous, est rouillée dans le Foureau, nos Doigts infatigables n'ont pas quitté la Plume depuis l'Année '58."[35] Although the garrison proper at Bedford was always small, the place had a larger population, chiefly a floating one to be sure, than it was again to have for fifty years. Military escorts accompanying convoys, wagoners and pack-horsemen, traders, camp followers—all these made it a lively post. And when the Indians became a real threat in 1763, all the near-by settlers, with their families and their livestock, crowded into Bedford for protection.

It was Ourry's primary duty to coördinate and push the many activities connected with supply. Even before he had full command

[32] To Bouquet, September 18, 1762: B.M. Add. MSS 21642. The first five letters in the partially alphabetical series stand, of course, for Aide Deputy Quarter Master General.

[33] B.M. Add. MSS 21652. In quoting from the various letterbooks in the *Bouquet Papers* I shall note hereafter only their British Museum number; since the correspondence is arranged chronologically, only dates will be given. Almost all of Ourry's letters are to be found in 21642. Quotations from 21642 are from the originals via photostat and microfilm; those from other letterbooks are from the transcriptions made by the Pennsylvania Historical Commission. (See note 3, *supra.*)

[34] General Stanwix to Bouquet, January 10, 1760: ". . . Bedford, where Ourry is to command for the present" (21638).

[35] Ourry to Bouquet, March 14, 1762 (21642).

at Bedford, he had the reputation of being a dependable administrator. "I have the Pleasure to inform you that thro the indefatigable Industry of Mr. Ourry this Garrison [Fort Ligonier] is already Stock'd with a quantity of Provisions sufficient till the 20th March & more daily expected."[36] "You will observe from the Returns that we are in no Want of Provisions which I presume must constantly be the Case in any Garrison which may be happy enough to have their Dependence in that Respect on Mr. Ourrey."[37] Four years later, in more trying times, Captain James Robertson, who had arrived at Bedford with a convoy of wagons and mutton on the hoof, wrote to Bouquet: "Cap^t Ourry is as usual indefatigable, & I own freely I wou'd be very much at a loss which hand to turn to if it was not for him."[38]

The riff-raff, however, found him far from helpful, particularly the many women who showed up at Bedford on anything but the King's business. If Ourry failed to solve this sociological problem, at least he followed the time-honored practice of passing it on to others. Thus Colonel John Armstrong, writing from Fort Ligonier:

> Nor [are] orders Obey'd by the Females I'm beginning to Duck & Drum out, but nothing less than force will persuade them to Visit their Old friend Capt. Ourry, by which he will naturally Suspect they have neither true hearts nor Sound Bottoms. They are in short the Bane of any Army, the Devil & two Sticks.[39]

"Merchants" who brought up liquor to trade with Indians or with soldiers who sought to supplement their rum-ration presented what was perhaps his worst headache. The devices employed by these bootleggers to hide their kegs equaled in ingenuity those employed in a recent era.[40] Another source of trouble was pilferage and theft.

> I lose all Patience, when I find it impossible to preserve such of His Majesty's Stores, as I have charge of, from the Plundering Hands of unjust & ungratefull men, who receive the King's Pay to guard & protect the very effects they Steal & embezzle. Nothing is spared; Horses, Saddles, Waggons, Provisions, Hay, Planks, all these & many other Articles, are every Day, Night & Hour, stolen by the neglect, or connivance of Centinels or Corporals (pour ne pas menter plus haut).[41]

Ourry never succeeded completely in putting an end to this evil, but he caught and punished many such thieves and kept losses as low as was possible under the circumstances.

The civilians, too, brought their problems to Ourry, not because he was in any respect a "soul-doctor," but because he was the chief symbol of authority in the Bedford area. One of the more amusing cases, at least in Ourry's eyes, he reported to Bouquet thus:

---

[36] Colonel Thomas Lloyd to Bouquet, February 19, 1759 (21644).
[37] Same to same, March 2, 1759 (21644).
[38] Ft. Bedford, July 13, 1763 (21649).
[39] To Bouquet, September 23, 1759 (21644).
[40] Ourry to Bouquet, May 15, 1762 (21642). "P. S. . . . Reste soit des Liqueurs qui me causent plus d'embaras que tout le reste du service."
[41] Same to same, December 20, 1758 (21642).

I have this Moment left the Bench, after reconciling two Parties on a very different and ticklish subject. A Burgher of this Metropolis complained to me that, in his absence, his Wife had—what they call in plain English, Cuckold'd him. I could not help it, but it recall'd to my mind the following Epigram, which I had read somewhere.

Cornus proclaims aloud his Wife a Whore
Alas! poor Cornus! What can we do more?
Were't thou *no* Cuckold we might make thee *one*
But, being *one* we cannot make thee *none*.

Therefore I sent the man Home & bad[e] him send his Wife to me (who, it appeared was going off with her Gallant, having already pack't up her Duds and sent them out of the house). . . . I read the Huzzy a Lecture, made her acknowledge her Crime, declare her Repentence and promise to be guilty of the like *no more*. Then sent for Cornus and made him promise to forget all past . . . tricks, at least not to repeat grievances, join'd their Hands again, & made them Kiss (before his Honour) and go home Friends. By the Intrigue I lose one of my Carpenters. . . .[42]

Ourry's life at Fort Bedford was by no means wholly burdensome. He certainly found pleasure in the writing of his letters; otherwise they would have been shorter and less playful in tone. He enjoyed laughing at himself, and was notorious for his puns. He showed an avid interest in vegetable gardens, and encouraged planting both by the soldiers and the villagers.

I can't stay in the House now [April 22, 1762]; the Gardens captivate me intirely. Had I but half as much skill in, as I have inclination for, gardening, nothing could exceed the product of my gardens. All my Inhabitants have each their little Spot of Ground, in which it is a pleasure to see them, from Morning till Night, Men, Women, Children, digging, raking, sowing & planting & those who have larger inclosures, ploughing, harrowing & fencing. And I am so conveniently situated that I can see the Whole d'un Coupe d'Oieil.[43]

In the following passage the garden, the pun, and what was perhaps his pet aversion, are woven together:

P.S. I have no Celery, nor Carrot Seed, nor much of any Sort—except of Patience, which C-pt-n Ph-l-ps has plentifully furnish'd me with having left me his whole Stock, Root, Branch & Embrio. It is literally Fact. And explains this Paradise [paradox?], that, I want Patience, because I have too much Patience.[44]

Ourry's most welcome diversions, however, were provided by the visits of kindred spirits passing through Bedford, and of these he enjoyed Bouquet's the most. The Colonel was not a "headquarters soldier"; he spent as much time as possible at the advanced posts and could be expected to go through Bedford several times each year on the "up" and "down" journeys. On one such visit, early in June, 1762, both Bouquet and Ourry suffered accidental injuries. There are many references to the incident in the letters of fellow officers, expressions of sympathy and hopes for rapid recoveries, but nowhere is there told

[42] April 20, 1762 (21642).
[43] To Bouquet (21642).
[44] To Bouquet, April 6, 1763 (21642). While patience is a species of dock, here, obviously, it must be classified as fauna, not flora.

what happened. We have to turn to a diary kept by a storekeeper at Fort Pitt to learn.

6mo 4th [1762] A man came today for ye Doctor in great Haste, Coll Boquet & Capt Orey at Bedford being riding out in a Chair ye Horse Run off & Broke the Chair, Broke Orys Leg & hurt ye Coll much
5th. Ye Man that came here for ye Doctor yesterday, is said to have come up in 25 hours from Bedford. . . .[45]

At Bedford in 1762 a broken leg was a very serious matter, as can be seen from the genuine solicitude expressed by Ourry's many friends.[46] The invalid, however, took his misfortune good-naturedly. He jested about his "bent" leg, and wrote (in French) an amusing account of his first experience on crutches. Typical of his spirit is the following:

Dear Colonel. The Doctor having revetied [*revetir*] my Leg with a Chemise of Ciment, which is to immure the weakest part thereof, and condemned me to my Bed 'till this Composition is sufficiently dry: I take this opportunity of his being gone to drink Tea with the Ladies, to answer your two letters, etc. . . .[47]

Some days later he wrote Bouquet that he would be glad when the Colonel's "Remembrance of our ever memorable Tumble will be so much blunted as to permit you to venture yourself again in my Government" for "Dieu sçait combien peu votre visite a répondu a mes esperances flateuses—pas un seul Moment de Conversation libre—tout le rebours du plaisir que je m'étois proposé dans un agreable tête à tête."[48] And nearly a year later, in anticipation of another visit from Bouquet, he wrote:

Daisy has perform'd her promise, and I allow the Calf all the Cream 'till you arrive, tho' I don't suppose the Strawberries will be ripe so soon. And I hope our meeting will differ, in some more material circumstances, from that of last Summer.[49]

But 1763 was not to be a year of strawberries and cream for either the Colonel or the Captain. All through the month of May, intelligence of Indian activity came in to the western posts. By the first of June there was no mistaking the dangerous situation; the concerted uprising of the tribes under Pontiac's leadership was in full swing. Captain Ecuyer, commanding at Fort Pitt, reported on May 30 that he believed "l'affaire generale" and trembled for the outposts, that he thought himself surrounded and expected an attack the next day, for which he was "passablement pret."[50] Presqu'Isle and LeBoeuf soon

[45] "Journal of James Kenny, 1761-1763," edited by John W. Gordon, *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 37 (1913), pp. 1-47, 152-201.

[46] See, for example, Captain Barnsley to Bouquet, Fort Pitt, June 6, 1762 (21648).

[47] July 11, 1762 (21642).

[48] July 20, 1762 (21642).

[49] April 22, 1763 (21642).

[50] To Bouquet (21649).

fell, along with Venango, where none survived the massacre. Pitt was closely besieged and communication with it completely cut off. Ligonier successfully fought off a severe attack. While Bedford did not suffer direct attack, thirty-three persons were killed or taken prisoner in its vicinity between May 28 and July 15.[51] The settlers flocked into Bedford. Ourry worked day and night on his defenses and organized the able-bodied civilian men into two companies of militia to supplement his tiny garrison of Royal Americans. Bouquet, at Philadelphia and Carlisle, kept in close touch with all developments while he labored to gather some odds and ends of troops in Pennsylvania and New York to lead to the relief of Fort Pitt.

We have fourteen letters written by Ourry to Bouquet in June, 1763, telling what was happening at Bedford. How the Captain responded to the crisis is best told in excerpts from some of these letters.

> If any Troops come up they must bring Powder, for we have very little here & that damaged. The Traders here have not an Ounce, so that I am obliged to Supply the Militia. I have armed them, & they mount Guard in Town at Night as I do in the Fort where I am about contriving to Save all the Rain Water it shall please God to Send us: That in case of a blockade, we may be able to make our Whiskey a quenchable Bevradge, and also quench any enflamed Arrows.
>
> Adieu, and be sure I will deffend the Rats in the Stores to the best of my Abilities. I wish I could convert them all into men. I would not begrudge them all the Stores they daily continue to eat & destroy.[52]

> I have also the Satisfaction to find myself well Supported by the generallity of the Country People. But I assure you, the Panic amongst them was so great and, unluckily, too much encouraged by those who had not resolution enough to wait for further intelligence, that it has been with the greatest Difficulty, & *utmost exertion of my Weak Oratory,* that I could persuade the Wavering to remain, but, having once convinced the most reasonable of the Folly of Flying from a Fort tenable, & well provided, before an Enemy, which, for ought they knew, would overtake them before Night; and removed the grand Difficulty, of those that fled from their Plantations, viz[t] the want of Subsistance, & Lodging for their Wives & Children: the whole, except a very few, determined chearfully to Assist me in the Deffence of this Barrier.
>
> I have accordingly, lodged & Victualed all the Families, that are come in, and Armed as many of the Men as were unprovided for their deffence.
>
> No less than 93 Families are now come here for refuge, and more hourly arriving. I expect Ten more before Night. My Militia Returns amount already to 155 Men, in two Companies, under the Captains Proctor & Lems. My Regulars are increased by Expresses &c: to 3 Corporals & 9 Private[s], no *Despicable Garrison!*[53]

> I shall miss no opportunity of writing to you in this Critical Juncture, tho' I am now apprehensive my Letters may not come to hand as I suppose you are

[51] "List of Persons Killed, Scalped, and Taken by the Indians in the Department of Fort Pitt, about Bedford," dated July 15 and signed by Ourry (21654). Two entries read:

June 17. Near Fort Bedford—James Clark & Peter Vanest kill'd and scalp'd.
June 18. Ditto —Chris[r] Diven, his father, wife & 6 Children, viz 5 sons & 1 daughter kill'd.

[52] June 1, 1763 (21649).

[53] June 3, 1763 (21649).

on the Road. Therefore for the future, I shall write directly to Sir Jeffrey Amherst, 'till I have the pleasure of Seeing you or Some other red Coat from below. . . .

A false Allarm, Yesterday [that Fort Ligonier had been burned and its garrison massacred], threw all the Inhabitants in Such a Consternation, that they were all packing up and moving off, nay, some without taking anything with them, that might in the least impede their flight. And, I suppose that before Night I should not have had twenty Men left, if any, except the Soldiers, had I not been luckily possest of a Letter the date of which convinced these people of the Mistake. . . .

I mentioned this to Shew the little dependance there is on Men that are not immediately under Command. I am pretty Confident that the appearance they make upon the Parade is what keeps off the Savages, therefore I woud fain prevail on them to Stay 'till Troops come up, which they seem resolved to do now. If I had but a Letter to produce with an Acc[t], whether true or false, of their being on the March, it would give them Spirits & encourage their perseverance. The inhabitants of the Town are very hearty. The Settlers that have fled from their plantations are the most Wavering. I am obliged to harrangue often, & not without Effect, as I know which way to take them, and many having known me long, have Some Confidence in me.

We live intirely on fresh Beef to Save our Salt Pork; I kill no Sheep neither because I can keep them in the Fort easily in case of a Blockade. And I have order'd a quantity of Biscuit to be baked for Scouting Parties, &c as well as to have Some to eat in the Fort, 'till we could get an Oven up in case we Should be Shut up.

Tho' I take all these precautions, and many others, I am of opinion the Indians will not Attack this Post, nor indeed commit any Hostilities (at least yet awhile) on this Side of the Mountains, which I suppose they look upon as the Limits, tho' I may be out in my Politicks, & therefore prepare for them. . . .[54]

If the Province intends to raise Troops they may have two Companies compleat here in two hours, one half of the Militia being ready willing & desirous of inlisting under their present Officers (but that I suppose the Assembly Won't allow). I have mentioned it to Governor Hamilton. . . .

[P.S.] All's Well. I have no Candles.[55]

Colonel Bouquet wrote to Ourry on June 14:

All the Measures you have taken are perfectly right, and I take particular Pleasure in making the People here [Philadelphia] sensible of the very great Service you have done to this Province, by keeping the Frontier People together till they can be supported and recover of their panic.[56]

After a few quiet days without incident Ourry's militiamen would often drift back to their "plantations," only again to rush for cover into Bedford on hearing news of the next scalping. Captain George Croghan happened to be with Ourry that June, and reported to Bouquet:

Cap[t] Orrey has Wrote you in full of what has hapen[d] Near Heer yesterday & today [see note 51, *supra*] which has Roster[d] him his Letle Militia Butt how Long they may Stay heer is uncartian as they have Very Letle provisions of there own. . . .

---

[54] "6 o'Clock A M," June 9, 1763 (21649).

[55] June 10, 1763 (21649).

[56] 21653; also General Amherst to Bouquet: "Captain Ourry does very well to Receive & Protect the Inhabitants; but I would not have him on any Account, put much Trust in them." New York, June 16, 1763 (21649).

P.S. I wish you wold Come up heer & See how we Live we have Madera Clerrett & Good Sperretts in plenty, besides y[e] sperretts within, Butt you must bring a Litle Sugar as we have Nott much and a Number of pour Inosents to Sheer with we Shell Burn Capt orruys Last Candle this Night So I hope you wont Lett us be Long in the Dark—A Due.[57]

Meanwhile Bouquet, exasperated by the delay and niggardliness of the Pennsylvania Assembly, had decided to march toward Fort Pitt and to wait no longer for the raising of provincial militia to strengthen his little force of regulars. From Carlisle he wrote rebukingly to Governor James Hamilton:

. . . When I wrote you, on the 2[d] of July, my sentiment relative to the Measures necessary to prevent the Ruin of the County, I did not expect to be so soon a Witness of it, and still less that the Assembly would pay no Regard to my Representations. . . . The few Troops voted by the Assembly can neither be raised in Time, nor when raised will they be able to save the People & their Harvest from Destruction; which could only have been effected by exerting the united Force of this, & York County in the manner I had proposed.

I march the Day after toMorrow to the Relief of Fort Pitt, & hope to draw the Attention of the Enemy upon me, & by that Means be of more Service to this People.[58]

Ten days after leaving Carlisle, Bouquet reached Bedford, where he rested his little army and convoy. He had only about five hundred men of the 42nd (Royal Highlanders) and 77th, and was forced to leave with Ourry thirty men who were unable to march further. Progress, even to the east of Bedford, had been slow—once it took thirty-six hours to advance three miles; to the westward, toward Pitt, lay the mountains and the worst part of the Forbes Road. But he pushed on as soon as possible, arrived at Ligonier on August 2, and at Edge Hill (Bushy Run) three days later. There he fought the two-day battle which broke the Indians' offensive and went on to relieve Fort Pitt in time to save the Province from disaster.

In the back-area, as far east as Carlisle, the inhabitants were still in panic. Bedford was overflowing with people for whom there was insufficient food. In the same letter in which he congratulated Bouquet for having "given the Savages such a Dose as has effectively cured them of the Itch of meddeling with us," Ourry described the scene at Bedford:

I have forwarded & provided Carriage for as many Women & Children as were willing to go below this Post, and indeed for a few more than were inclined—and have notified to those that chuse to stay, that it must be on their own *Bottoms*, no Provisions being allowed at this Post for Women. . . .

Before Noon [August 20] the Town was like a Fair. The mottled Crew of Women, Children, Drivers, Sorebacks, & Sidesaddles, that flocked in, furnished, thro' the Dust that they had kicked up, a diverting scene, to those that had

---

[57] June 18, 1763 (21649). Croghan was an agent of Sir William Johnson, the King's Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the American colonies; his experience in trade and negotiation with the Indians was extensive. Both Johnson and Croghan are included in the *DNB*.

[58] July 13, 1763 (21649).

nothing to do with them, but to me it was far otherwise, tho' I had not much trouble with them that Day, the sending the *Dumb* Creatures to pasture being my first Care. . . .

The next Day being the Sabbath, was a Day of rest; nevertheless I was harrassed with many Petitions & Intreaties, and my Floor was sprinkled partly with Mothers Tears, & partly with Children's P-ss—Distressful Scene!

The Monday was a Day of Toil—draughting the Horses & appointing the Drivers—Matching stubborn Women with ill-natur'd Waggoners—and impudent Strumpets with knavish Horse-masters, but finally I started the Carravan, and the Spit-fires lay that Night at the Snake Spring.[59]

Most of the danger from Indians was now past, although Ourry himself was still to have that same year a narrow escape from death,[60] and occasional scalpings near Bedford continued. There followed a period of many months during which all hands turned to the task of restoring order in the Department. Major Campbell of the 42nd, at Bedford en route eastward with the wounded from Bushy Run, found Ourry "very Alert and Cliver at this post in forwarding the Service."[61] Ourry, of course, had much to do with the many convoys of supplies going forward to Fort Pitt and personally commanded the large one which left Bedford in the middle of October.[62] There was talk that he was to be permanently transferred to Pitt. Captain Callender, at Carlisle, urged Bouquet not to remove Ourry from Bedford:

Captain Ourry informs me of his going to Fort Pitt, which I am Verry [sorry] for, as I am well assured there is no one will Succeed him that can Transact the Business So well as himself, and therefore I woud be Much oblig'd to you, if you Woud Dispatch him back again as soon as Convenient; & the Country Seems much dissatisf[ied] at it, altho' they Say he is a Devil, yet a known one to them, Which they Wou'd rather put up With than a Stranger. As for my Own part I cant tell how to Manage Business Without Captain Ourry is at Bedford. . . .[63]

Ourry's days at Bedford during the first few months of 1764 continued to be busy ones, but no noteworthy incident occurred there that year. Amherst had been relieved as Commander in Chief by Gage in November, 1763, and in consequence Ourry, whose accounts had not been settled for a long time, was ordered to New York, where he

---

59 August 27, 1763 (21642).

60 Ecuyer to Bouquet, November 13, 1763 (21649). "Le Captn Ourry vint le matin au Camp pour nous voir, mais nous étions partis, et il fut bien près d'en etre la Victime, car le drivers fut tué fort près de lui. . . ."

61 To Bouquet, September 4, 1763 (21649).

62 The composition of a convoy may be of interest to the reader. The one which Ourry got started out of Bedford on November 10 had cattle, several wagons (with 73 barrels of pork and 18 bushels of salt), and more than 235 pack horses loaded as follows:

73—salt
120—flour
12—whiskey
15—clothing
15—officers' baggage, tents and a few kegs of butter
Some spare horses

63 October 12, 1763 (21649).

arrived about June 1, 1764.[64] To his great disgust he met with nothing but delay and the only too well-known military run-around. Ourry's comments about Gage and his headquarters are extremely frank and bespeak great trust in Bouquet, to whom they are addressed.[65]

[June 4] I would have wrote to you sooner but had nothing to add to my last by Cogh [. . .], the General & other Public Officers having been almost every Day engaged at Turttle Feasts & other Parties of Pleasure in the Country. And you may be sure this Day will not be productive of much Business, except that of Eating & Drinking, the effects of which will probably be felt tomorrow also. I have just been with Colonel Robertson, with whom I left my Acc[ts] three or four days ago, & who was to speak to the General concerning them. He tells me he has not been able to see him since tho' he has tried. We shall certainly have an Audience toDay, but it will be in the feasting way—at the New Vaux-Hall where the General entertains the Army, Navy &c.—but the post will go out first, so all I can say is that I must take patience. . . .[66]

[June 6] De jour en jour mon Dégoût pour le Service augmente: je scai que mon eloignement de vous y contribue, et s'il continue je deviendrai incurable. L'embaras de tenir des Comptes, et les mortifications qu'il faut essuier pour les passer, apres s'être reduit presque a la mendicité, dans un Departement odieux m'ont presque determiné a quiter le Service entierement: mais je fais trop de Cas de vos Conseils pour rien entreprendre sans vous consulter. Ce qu'il y a de certain c'est que si ce n'etoit pour le plaisir de faire la Compagne sous vos Ordres, je passerois tout de suite en Europe—but more of that when we meet.[67]

Days passed, and Ourry got nowhere, except perhaps with the cultivation of his patience—or disgust.

[June 23] I told that Gentleman [Captain Prevost] that I saw *here* no encouragement to continue in the Service, but, I refer you on that Subject to my letters from hence, & more particularly to our next meeting, after which, I believe I cannot easily part with you. We came in this Country together, we have Served constantly together, and if after another Campaign, (more agreeable, I would hope than the former) we can go home together, sans reproche, I shall think myself happy. Am just going to the Gen[l] to try again to obtain his positive & ultimate Orders, which I wish may concur with my Inclination to continue under yours. . . .[68]

[June 24] Yesterday morning I was an hour with the General, and returned as wise as I went—nothing decided—but I suppose about the middle of the Week I shall be released. . . . Je perds patience—si ce n'etoit qu'il depêche les autres egalement, je croirois qu'il est devenu amoureux de moi. . . .[69]

---

[64] Ourry was relieved of command at Fort Bedford on April 14, 1764, by Lieutenant Charles Menzies of the Royal Highlanders, and probably left soon thereafter for New York. See "Return of the Officers who Commanded at Fort Bedford from 25th Day of December, 1763 to the 24 of December 1764," dated December 24, 1764 (21651).

[65] Let it be said, to the credit of many of the British officers in the colonies at this time, that they usually spoke their minds in their letters, in spite of all the "Obedient & Humble Servants" found subscribed thereto. They do not often appear to have hidden their true beliefs and convictions under the cover of impersonality, a practice which, seemingly, is of more recent development.

[66] 21642.

[67] 21642.

[68] 21650.

[69] 21642.

Ourry finally worked his way out of Gage's web and was back at Bedford by the first of September, just in time to take command of a convoy, consisting of many wagons and five hundred pack horses, headed toward Pitt to supply Bouquet, then about to start on his expedition into the West. Ourry's report to the Colonel, written from his "Camp at the Foot of Turttle Creek-Hill" on September 19, is in the form of a journal covering each day of the week's march from Bedford. It is the last item in the letterbook containing almost all of his letters (B.M. Add. MSS 21642), and only one letter later in date appears in the entire series of Bouquet Papers. From this time (September, 1764) on I can trace Ourry's life in only the sketchiest of outlines.

He commanded the pack train of four divisions when Bouquet's expedition left Fort Pitt on October 3 to advance into the heart of the Indian country, in what is now the state of Ohio. The best account of this very successful operation is Bouquet's own long and detailed report to Governor John Penn telling of the march, the several conferences with the Seneca, Delaware, and Shawnee chiefs, and the final negotiation of the Indian capitulation, which included the delivery of some two hundred white prisoners.[70] At each of the six general conferences held between October 17 and November 14, the whites were represented by Colonel Bouquet, thirteen officers (including Ourry), Alexander McKee, Assistant Agent for Indian Affairs, and an interpreter, David Owens. At the "private Conference" with chiefs of the Delawares on November 11, Bouquet had with him only Captains Reid and Ourry, and McKee. Very likely it was Ourry who sorted the prisoners as they were brought in by the Indians and who classified them as Virginians or Pennsylvanians, as Men or as Women and Children; the list of their names in those classifications as it was published on the front page of Franklin's *Pennsylvania Gazette* at Philadelphia on January 17, 1765, is signed "LEWIS OURRY, Assistant Deputy Quarter-Master-General." It is plain that Bouquet was leaning heavily on Ourry in "Operations" as well as in "Supply."

The last direct word from Ourry that I have found anywhere is his letter to Bouquet written "in the Smoak at 3 o'Clock A.M. within five miles of Tuscawaras" on November 20 while on the return march to Fort Pitt. He had overtaken the Light Horse, encamped for the night, and had found "Poor Williams in his tent greatly distressed with his Gout." Williams had not slept for five nights and four days,

> yet between the Intervals of Pain, he is in tolerable Spirits: we supped together, and as he loves a little gaming, I indulged him in a Wager, of a Dollar; that I would be at Fort Pitt, Thursday Night. . . . So don't wonder that I only wait

[70] This letter, dated November 15, 1764, at his "Camp at the Forks of the Muskingham," is printed in full in *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania,* IX (Harrisburg, 1852), 207-33. Bouquet sent an almost identical report to Governor Francis Fauquier of Virginia. He included in "upwards of 200 Captives delivered" the Indians' "own Children born from White Women."

the Moon's rising to set off. . . . I don't *remain* but *go* Dear Sir,

Your most obedient, Humble servant

L^s Ourry.[71]

Thus, characteristically, with a jest and a pun Ourry disappears from sight, to become thereafter only a name in the *Army Lists*[72] and the subject of brief mention by Boswell and Mrs. Grant of Laggan. It is probable that he returned to England in 1765. With the disbanding of some of the units of the Royal American Regiment in 1764 and 1765, many officers, Ourry one of them, went on the Half-Pay List. His Army status in subsequent years (as found in the annual volumes of the *Army List*) is here given:

1765—	Lieutenant	—74th Regiment of Foot, Invalids
1766—	Captain (Half-Pay)	—60th Regiment of Foot
1767—	Lieutenant	—74th Regiment of Foot, Invalids
1768—	ditto	—ditto
1769—	ditto	—ditto
1770—	ditto	—ditto
1771—	Captain (Half-Pay)	—60th Regiment of Foot (Ourry is here the senior of twelve half-pay captains of the 60th.)
1772—	ditto	—ditto
1773—	Captain	—15th Regiment of Foot (While Ourry's date of rank in the Army is December 12, 1760, that in the regiment is July 15, 1772, which made him the sixth in rank of seven captains in the 15th, and junior to D'Aripé, whose date of rank in the regiment was June 22, 1770.)
1774—	ditto	—ditto
1775—	ditto	—ditto
1776—	ditto	—ditto (According to the War Office records, however, Ourry retired in 1775.)

The 15th, or Yorkshire East Riding, Regiment of Foot had been Amherst's own regiment from 1756 to 1768 and saw much service in Canada and the West Indies. George III reviewed it at Chatham in 1771, after which it spent a year in Yorkshire, whence it marched to Scotland in 1772. After garrison duty at Fort Augustus all through 1773 it embarked for Ireland in the spring of 1774 at Port Patrick.[73]

When and where Ourry joined the 15th I do not know, but it is certain that he accompanied it to Ireland. Mrs. Grant, then Anne Macvicar and residing at Fort Augustus, wrote two letters to Anne Ourry (in 1774 and 1775) in which she refers to her correspondent's being then in Ireland, along with her brother, the Captain, and his

---

[71] 21651. The name Tuscawaras is today attached to a county in Ohio and to a small town about halfway between Zanesville and Canton in that state.

[72] See note 13, *supra*. These volumes attempt to give the status of each officer in the Army on the first of March of the year of publication.

[73] Richard Cannon, *Historical Record of the Fifteenth or Yorkshire East Riding Regiment of Foot* (London, 1848), pp. 36, 37.

wife. The British-American crisis of 1775 was felt deeply by Mrs. Grant, for she had spent part of her girlhood in the New York colony. She foresaw the war to come and wrote to Miss Ourry on March 10, 1775:

My pleasure [in receiving a letter] changed too soon to melancholy, when I understood the dreadful dilemma you are all in about this American voyage, which impends too surely over you: I had indeed heard that the 15th were under orders for America, but did not dream of Captain Ourry's accompanying them; and I examined every newspaper in hopes of finding his name changed, or sold out. How grieved and surprized was I to hear that he is in danger of being once more torn from the embraces of a family so dear to him, who have already spent so many tedious years in lamenting his absence, and this to plunge into the most cruel and horrid of wars: whose most desirable event can be only that of successfully devastating with bloodshed and destruction a country, late the most peaceful and happy on earth, but never, never, to be happy more, end this as it may. . . . How dear must victory be bought with the lives of our fellow subjects and former friends! . . . Tell the Captain and his lady I rejoice in their kind remembrance of me, and shall never forget them.[74]

For want of further information I must leave the Captain in Ireland with the 15th Regiment, then already "under orders for America." He probably was able to sell his captaincy and thus to escape another campaign overseas. One is left with many questions about the man, some of which may in time be answered if a sufficient number of documents have survived and can be found. First are the matters of the dates and places of his birth and death. Who was his wife? Did his daughter ever marry?[75] What has been the fate of the many letters we are certain that he wrote to his family during the eight or nine years, "tedious years" for them, of duty with the 60th in America? Certainly some letters other than those so carefully saved by Bouquet in a separate letterbook may yet be found. And how interesting it would be to compare Ourry's treatment of the same day, event, or person in a letter sent to his wife and one forwarded "On His Majesty's Service" to Colonel Bouquet.

A chance association led to my identification of Johnson's and Boswell's Ourry with the former commanding officer at Fort Bedford, a discovery possibly worth a future footnote to the *Journal*. Some months of acquaintance with Captain Ourry, however, have led me to believe that he has sufficient stature to stand alone in epistolary literature as well as in history. He has no need to ride further on Dr. Johnson's coat-tails.

University of Washington

[74] *Letters from the Mountains*, I, 181, 182, 188.

[75] In 1755 Ourry appears to have had more than one daughter, but in 1763 he mentions "Sept Ans d'absence de Femme & Enfant" and again his having "a daughter Marriageable." To Bouquet, February 5 and March 10, 1763 (21642).

THE TITLES OF *LOOK HOMEWARD, ANGEL: A STORY OF THE BURIED LIFE*

By W. P. ALBRECHT

For his first novel Thomas Wolfe considered the titles *The Building of a Wall* and *Alone, Alone*. From Bath, England, July 19, 1926, he wrote to Mrs. J. M. Roberts:

> I have begun work on a book, a novel, to which I may give the title of *The Building of a Wall* . . . its unity is simply this: I am telling the story of a powerful creative element trying to work its way toward an essential isolation; a creative solitude; a secret life—its fierce struggles to wall this part of its life away from birth, first against the public and savage glare of an unbalanced, nervous brawling family group; later against school, society, all the barbarous invasions of the world. In a way, the book marks a progression toward freedom; in a way toward bondage—but this does not matter: to me one is as beautiful as the other.[1]

Later, from New York in an undated letter to Mrs. Roberts, Wolfe wrote of his first novel:

> I think I shall call it *Alone, Alone,* for the idea that broods over it, and in it, and behind it is that we are all strangers upon this earth we walk on—that naked and alone do we come into life, and alone, a stranger, each to each, we live upon it.[2]

Each of these titles suggests isolation as the theme of the novel; but the first implies a voluntary and, for the "creative element" at least, a desirable isolation, while the second implies an inescapable and undesirable one. The final choice of *Look Homeward, Angel,* supported by its context in *Lycidas,* is appropriate to both of these themes, with the additional implication of the search consummated. The subtitle, *A Story of the Buried Life,* is less dramatic but, in suggested parallels to Matthew Arnold's poem, it is perhaps an even clearer indication of the unity of the book.

The parallels in *Lycidas* and *The Buried Life* will be more evident, however, after an examination of the two kinds of isolation in *Look Homeward, Angel*: the inevitable and the creative.

Man's inevitable strangeness and loneliness results not only from his inability to know others and to be known by them but from the feeling that he once enjoyed a refuge from isolation and doubt which, in the prison of this life, he can almost but not quite recover. Eugene's life in *Look Homeward, Angel* is a continual search for this refuge, apparently the same quest that Wolfe describes in "The Story of a Novel": "man's search to find a father . . . the image of a strength and

[1] "Writing Is My Life: Letters of Thomas Wolfe," *Atlantic Monthly,* Vol. 178, No. 6 (December, 1946), 66.

[2] "Writing Is My Life: Munich and New York," *Atlantic Monthly,* Vol. 179, No. 1 (January, 1947), 39.

wisdom external to his need and superior to his hunger, to which the belief and power of his own life could be united."[3] This refuge, the "ghost of memory" leads one to believe, was a part of prenatal existence;[4] but rather than a heavenly home, as in Wordsworth's *Ode: Intimations of Immortality,* this prenatal life appears to be the endless concatenation of cause and effect preceding and shaping the circumstances of Eugene's birth and life, extending beyond the barren South of the Pentlands to the abundance of Gant's Pennsylvania and still farther back beyond the seas. Thus, Eugene's preëxistence is linked with the better time of the Gants, with "the great barns of Pennsylvania, the ripe bending of golden grain, the plenty, the order, the clean thrift" of Oliver's boyhood in contrast with "this vast lost earth of rickets" and the Pentlands.[5] But the inadequacy of the past to supply Wolfe's spiritual father is the inadequacy of Gant himself, who perhaps no more than Eliza can show Eugene "the lost lane-end into heaven, a stone, a leaf, an unfound door."[6] Gant, like Eugene, also wished to become an artist, "to wreak something dark and unspeakable in him into cold stone"; but the only "stone" he found was the clumsy angel of Carrara marble, bought for $420 and finally—and regretfully —sold as a tombstone for a prostitute. Gant "never learned to carve an angel's head."[7] For Gant the past of both Pennsylvania abundance and creative imagination was gone forever—and, with it, its promise of resolving Eugene's loneliness and doubt.

> Unweave the fabric of nights and days [Eugene demands of the stranger within him]; unwind my life back to my birth; subtract me into nakedness again, and build me back with all the sums I have not counted. Or let me look upon the living face of darkness; let me hear the terrible sentence of your voice.
>
> There was nothing but the living silence of the house; no doors were opened.[8]

If his "home" were in the past, Eugene knew that he could not go home again. For freedom, security, and certitude he had to search elsewhere.

In *Look Homeward, Angel,* therefore, are suggested the three time elements that Wolfe later mentions as inherent in the material accumulated for *Of Time and the River.*

> The first and most obvious was an element of actual present time, an element which carried the narrative forward. . . . The second time element was of past time, one which represented these same characters as acting and as being acted upon by all the accumulated impact of man's experience so that each moment of their life was conditioned not only by what they experienced in that moment, but by all that they had experienced up to that moment. In addition to these two time elements, there was a third which I conceived as being time immutable . . . a

[3] "The Story of a Novel," *Saturday Review of Literature,* XIII, No. 8 (December 21, 1935), 4.

[4] *Look Homeward, Angel* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930), pp. 37-38. Cf. pp. 81 ff.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 5.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. [2].

[7] *Ibid.,* pp. 4, 264-68.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 494. Cf. p. 296.

kind of eternal and unchanging universe of time against which would be projected the transience of man's life. . . .[9]

For Eugene the past is lost as something separate, but it remains partly in the life-principle, continually renewing itself in transitory forms,[10] and—what is more important in the unity of *Look Homeward, Angel*—in the cumulation of experience that is Eugene's essential self:

> I am, [Eugene] thought, a part of all that I have touched and that has touched me, which, having for me no existence save that which I gave it, became other than itself by being mixed with what I then was, and is now still otherwise, having fused with what I now am, which is itself a cumulation of what I have been becoming.[11]

It is in this self that Eugene finally finds the promise of a desirable or creative isolation, but in the meantime he explores a different world of imagination: he becomes Bruce-Eugene of sentimental fiction, the Dixie Ghost of the movies, Ace Gant the falcon of the skies.[12] Beyond the hills of Altamont he creates a world of "golden cities" where there is no confusion, waste, or groping, where merit is rewarded with "its true deserving";[13] he builds up in himself "a vast mythology" which is all the more attractive because he knows it to be untrue; he begins "to feel that it [is] not truth that men must live for—the creative men—but for falsehood"[14]—until in the moment of insight that closes the novel, "the golden cities sicken in his eye. . . ."[15] In Eugene's imagination Ben has returned to life, convincing Eugene that "the world" is not beyond the hills of experience but in himself. " 'Where, Ben?' " Eugene asks. " 'Where is the world?' " " 'Nowhere,' " Ben replies. " '*You* are your world.' "[16] No leaf, Eugene realizes, "hangs for [him] in the forest"; he will "lift no stone upon the hills"; he will "find no door in any city"; but "in the city of [him]self" he will find the forgotten language, the lost world, a door where [he] may enter, and music strange as any ever sounded. . . ."[17]

This microcosmic self is, apparently, the essential self of fused experience—especially sense experience—which Eugene discovered before, apparently in his twelfth year, but had neglected for the golden cities. A pattern of experience originally disparate in time but now fused by the imagination, it is distinguished from the "ghostliness" of the time-space world by "brightness" and reality.[18] Here is Wolfe's bright world of creation. On February 2, 1930, Wolfe wrote to Mrs. Roberts:

---

[9] "The Story of a Novel," *Saturday Review of Literature*, XIII, No. 9 (December 28, 1935), 3.

[10] *Look Homeward, Angel*, pp. 582-83.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 104-08, 203, 270-75, 533.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 224.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 623.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 624.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 623-25.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 191-92.

experience comes into me from all points, is digested and absorbed into me until it becomes a part of me, and . . . the world I create is *always inside* me, and never *outside* me, and . . . what reality I can give to what I create comes only from *within*. . . . I shaped and created its reality from within: my *own* world, my *own* figures, my *own* events shaped themselves into my *own* fable there on the page before me, and . . . I spent no time in thinking of actual Smiths, Joneses, or Browns; nor do I see yet how such a thing is possible. If anyone thinks it is, let him take notes at street corners, and see if the result is a book.[19]

Furthermore, in "The Story of a Novel" Wolfe explicitly names the "door" of his search as the door to creative power,[20] and again he represents his creative power as issuing from his cumulative self. In Paris in the summer of 1930, while Wolfe was working on *Of Time and the River,* "the million forms and substances" of his life in America swarmed in "blazing pageantry" across his mind, issuing even from the "farthest adyt of his childhood before conscious memory had begun," yet transformed with the new wonder of discovery; and as he resolved to find words that would bring these forms to life in a "final coherent union," "the line and purpose of [his] life was shaped."[21] His experiences in France in 1930, like Eugene's final interview with Ben in *Look Homeward, Angel,* made Wolfe aware of his source of strength as an artist. This discovery must be distinguished, of course, from merely going "home" to the past. In this sense, it has been pointed out, Wolfe "did not go home again, finally. He returned instead to the actual America. . . . He returned to his senses: the exceptionally alert, acute senses that were the spring of his art."[22] But he did not simply record sense impressions. He was aware that his remembered experiences, modified by each other and by new experiences, were continually fusing into a new unity.

This source of strength bears a close resemblance to the "genuine self" of *The Buried Life*. This self is the complex of sympathy, understanding, security, freedom, and articulateness ordinarily obscured by timid imitation and selfish competition, and but infrequently realized in moments of love. The aspect of the buried life that led Wolfe to use Arnold's phrase in the closing chapters of *Of Time and the River* is its suggestion of common humanity, for in the little French towns Eugene has rediscovered "the buried life, the fundamental structure of the great family of earth to which all men belong": a discovery that "filled him with a quiet certitude and joy."[23] This theme of common humanity is, of course, developed further in *You Can't Go Home Again,* but although it is suggested in *Look Homeward, Angel,* in his

---

[19] "Writing Is My Life: The Novelist under Fire," *Atlantic Monthly,* Vol. 179, No. 2 (February, 1947), 55-56.

[20] "The Story of a Novel," *Saturday Review of Literature,* XIII, No. 8 (December 21, 1935), 15.

[21] *Ibid.,* XIII, 3, 15.

[22] Herbert J. Muller, *Thomas Wolfe* (Norfolk, Connecticut, 1947), p. 75.

[23] *Of Time and the River* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946), p. 755.

first novel Wolfe is more interested in other aspects of the buried life: its concealment and its creative power.

In *The Buried Life,* as in *Look Homeward, Angel,* "disguises" render men "alien to the rest / Of men, and alien to themselves. . . ." Furthermore, both Eugene and the "we" of Arnold's poem are searching for truth and articulateness, but the source of knowledge and power, although within Eugene and "us," is difficult to make use of. Frequently, Arnold points out, we long to discover in "our buried life" the direction of our lives—"to know / Whence our lives come and where they go." But truth and knowledge remain elusive when we assume other selves—like Bruce-Eugene of the golden cities—which, supplying only a "stupefying," "benumbing" power, do not let us "say or do" the truth. Meanwhile, just as Eugene sickened in his search for the golden cities, we are made "melancholy" by "airs" and "floating echoes" from the "soul's subterranean depth unborne / As from an infinitely distant land. . . ." But in rare moments of insight, achieved through love, come articulateness, knowledge, and direction.

> The eye sinks inward, and the heart lies plain,
> And what we mean, we say, and what we would, we know.
> A man becomes aware of his life's flow. . . .
> The hills where his life rose,
> And the sea where it goes.

In *Look Homeward, Angel,* as well, strong feeling for a loved one precedes moments of insight and the resulting awareness of direction in life. After the death of Ben, closest of all the Gants to Eugene, Eugene first fully realizes the irrevocableness of the past and the continuity of the life-principle, eternal and unchanging, behind the progression of evanescent forms.[24] The last chapter, in which the answer to Eugene's search is made most explicit, follows a moment of inarticulate feeling between Eugene and Eliza.[25] And, of course, it is Ben once more through whom the final revelation of self is made to Eugene. In this moment of vision, the direction of Eugene's life becomes plain: his path lies always ahead, never back toward the irrecoverable past, but into the future of the essential, creative self, which can never be the same as it has been. He was "like a man who stands upon a hill above the town he has left, yet does not say 'the town is near,' but turns his eyes upon the distant soaring ranges."[26]

These parallels, of course, are not drawn to suggest that *Look Homeward, Angel* is merely a dramatization of *The Buried Life* or that Wolfe borrowed a system of thought from Arnold. The essential self as a spiritual being obscured by imitation and conformity in earthly life, as the one, real, enduring self beyond or above the many, apparent, and passing selves, and as the source of truth and creative

---

[24] *Look Homeward, Angel,* pp. 582-83.
[25] *Ibid.,* p. 615.
[26] *Ibid.,* pp. 625-26.

power realized in moments of emotion, is a familiar concept in Neo-Platonic and transcendental thought. To mention only a few writers who left other traces in Wolfe's novels, it is a central concept in Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Emerson, and Whitman.

In Wordsworth's *Ode: Intimations of Immortality* the emotional cycle of incarnation—the memory of a bright existence before birth, the sense of loss in the dark prison of worldly life, the obscuring shadow of imitation, and the brightening promise of recovery—is much the same as Eugene's. Wolfe's resolution of the lost-home theme, like Wordsworth's, is partly in the "soothing thoughts" from "human suffering" and partly in foreseeing, after death, reintegration with the eternal forces animating the phenomenal world; but Wolfe, like Emerson in "Self-Reliance," stresses the realization of self, and its concomitant powers, in this life.[27]

Eugene's imaginative process also recalls Coleridge's distinction between imagination and fancy. In fact, in describing Eugene's power of imagination Wolfe uses Coleridge's own word "esemplastic."[28] Coleridge classifies imagination as primary and secondary. The former is "the living power and prime agent of all human perception, and . . . a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM." For Eugene, too, perception and creation are one and the same; all that he touched and that touched him had "no existence save that which [he] gave it. . . ." In the sense that the primary imagination *creates,* the secondary imagination may be said to *re-create;* "co-existing with the conscious will," it is the translating of creative power into a work of art. Whereas fancy deals with "fixities and definites," secondary imagination "dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to re-create: or . . . at all events, it struggles to idealize and to unify."[29] Similarly, Wolfe strove to transmute the fused experience of his cumulative self into a unity of verbal expres-

---

[27] Cf., for suggested parallels to the *Ode,* Maxwell Geismar, *Writers in Crisis* (Boston, 1942), p. 194; and Monroe M. Stearns, "The Metaphysics of Thomas Wolfe," *College English,* VI (January, 1945), 195-99. Mr. Stearns shows Wolfe's early and continued interest in Wordsworth and his recognition, in the poetry of both Wordsworth and Coleridge, of his own feeling toward life. Book III of *The Prelude,* Mr. Stearns continues, suggested Wolfe's refrain "a stone, a leaf, an unfound door," which expresses (1) the loss of the protector-mother relationship and (2) the search for a father, which "becomes, as well, the search for God." The "door," therefore, is "the entrance both back to the protective maternal womb and to the heaven from which, in the Platonic doctrine, we in our essence come." This interpretation of Wolfe's lost-home metaphor is helpful and, in these terms, unexceptionable; but it remains, perhaps, misleadingly metaphorical. "God" suggests freedom, security, and certitude; but it also suggests, as in the *Ode,* a sentient Being immanent in man, at once his origin and his destiny; whereas Wolfe, in resolving the lost-home theme, emphasizes, more than these aspects of God, the discovery of his (or Eugene's) source of strength as an artist.

[28] Spelled "esymplastic" in *Look Homeward, Angel,* p. 201.

[29] *Biographia Literaria,* Everyman's Library (London, 1934), Chap. XIII, pp. 159-60.

sion, repudiating—with the "notes at street corners"—the "fixities and definites" of fancy.

Thus, the form and ideas suggested by "the buried life" could be accounted for by influences other than Arnold's; but because Wolfe's thought and imagery had formed a pattern resembling Arnold's in *The Buried Life,* Wolfe found in this poem an accurate and suggestive subtitle for his novel.

In view of Eugene's question and Ben's answer, "Look Homeward" appears to be Ben's admonition to Eugene to find refuge within himself. "Home" also suggests Eugene's home in Altamont (and Wolfe's in Asheville), the prenatal complex of cause and effect, and perhaps the inextinguishable life-principle reflected in the passing forms of life. But the essential self of Eugene's accumulated experience comprises all three of these "homes" transmuted into material for artistic creation. Self-reliance at least promises to open the door to creati.e solitude.

There remains to be examined Wolfe's use of the word "angel." In *Lycidas* the "Angel" is evidently that "of the guarded Mount," who is asked to look nearer home rather than off to "Namancos and Bayona's hold" and to have pity on the drifting corpse of Lycidas. By analogy to this situation, Ben would seem to be the angel and Eugene Lycidas. "Angel" suggests a spirit secure in eternal life; "ghost" a spirit lost in death. The opposition of these terms occurs first at the beginning of the novel, where the passage prefacing Chapter One ends with the line "O lost, and by the wind grieved, ghost come back again," and where, as though in response to this cry, the next page begins with the title "Look Homeward, Angel!" Again, in the last chapter Ben repeats that he is "not dead," that he is "not a ghost," so that Eugene wonders whether he himself is not the ghost.[30] Ben is not explicitly named "angel," it is true, but the identification is further implied by the stone angels' coming to life when Ben returns and, when he departs, by their freezing again into immobility.[31]

Among the more frequent allusions to the title are Ben's bitter asides to his "dark Angel"; whereas Eugene finds an angel or guardian in Ben himself. This is a dark angel, too—dark even when Ben returns from the dead, his face obscured by the "shadow of his gray felt hat. . . ."[32] But as his interview with Eugene continues, Ben becomes "bright"; for he is alive not only in the universal life-principle—in "flower and leaf," in the "majestic processionals" of the seasons[33]—but also in Eugene's cumulative self. This "deathless" and "unchanging Ben," like other experiences integral with Eugene's true self, is the timeless cumulation of all the Bens that Eugene knew,

---

[30] *Look Homeward, Angel,* pp. 618-20.
[31] *Ibid.,* pp. 618, 620, 626.
[32] *Ibid.,* p. 617.
[33] *Ibid.,* pp. 582-83, 623.

the "one" compounded of "many." "Eugene watched the army of himself and Ben, which were not ghosts. . . ." No longer dark, "the fierce bright horde of Ben spun in and out of its deathless loom."[34] Also in this second aspect of his aliveness, Ben is again linked with the stone angels in the shop. A stone angel in a Baltimore street first incited Gant to carve in stone;[35] the angels in his shop stand for his creative impulse and, in their marble deadness, for its frustration. But with Ben's return the angels come alive and with them the creative power within Eugene. As the angels melt from their stone rigidity, so does the angel Ben "melt with ruth," and the "hapless" Eugene is wafted "homeward." From "the shores and sounding seas" where his "bones are hurled" Lycidas is "mounted high" in heaven. He is recalled from death to life, from the darkness of the sinking day-star to its brilliance in the morning sky, from being lost to being found, from imprisonment and impotence to freedom and power. Although limited to life in this world, this is the metamorphosis sought for, and partly consummated, by Eugene in *Look Homeward, Angel.* In this sense, Lycidas-Eugene is at least on his way to becoming an "angel," and the title is appropriately addressed to Eugene as well as to Ben.

Therefore, the themes of both inevitable and creative isolation and the resolution of the former into the latter are implicit in the titles finally chosen for *Look Homeward, Angel.* "A Story of the Buried Life" refers to the essential self, which in Arnold's poem has the same qualities as in *Look Homeward, Angel*: especially strangeness and latent power; whereas "Look Homeward, Angel" suggests the transition, and the method of transition, from mere lostness in isolation toward an integrated, creative solitude.

University of New Mexico

[34] *Look Homeward, Angel*, p. 622.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

DIE DEUTSCHE IDYLLE SEIT GESSNER

Von IGNACE FEUERLICHT

Gewöhnlich stellt man sich unter dem Begriff "deutsche Idylle" etwas wie eine zierliche, von den Kunstgärtnern Geßner und Voß in einigen Exemplaren gezüchtete Blume vor, die im Boden der "Zurück zur Natur!" -Richtung des 18. Jahrhunderts einige Wurzeln fassen konnte, den rauhen Stürmen und der Kälte des 19. und gar des 20. Jahrhunderts aber nicht gewachsen war. Wir wollen nun versuchen zu zeigen, daß die deutsche Idylle eine gesunde und weit verbreitete Naturpflanze ist, die gerade in der Härte neuerer Zeiten neue Nahrung gefunden hat. Nach einem Vergleich mit anderen Gattungen, insbesondere der Dorfgeschichte, die angeblich an der Stelle der Idylle aufgeblüht ist, werden wir auf ihren Stoff und ihre Form eingehen.

I

Theobald Ziegler erklärt in seinem Aufsatz "Das Idyll und seine Hauptvertreter im 18. Jahrhundert,"[1] daß im 19. Jahrhundert die Dorfgeschichte an Stelle des Idylls ebenso getreten sei wie der Roman an die Stelle des Epos. Ähnlich urteilt Gustav Schneider über die Idylle: "Im großen und ganzen kann man sagen, daß sie im 19. Jahrhundert aufhört ein organisch lebendiges Produkt des dichterischen Geistes zu sein. An ihre Stelle sind dann, besonders seit den vierziger Jahren, die sogenannten Dorfgeschichten getreten."[2] Nach J. Clivio liegt unsrer Zeit die eigentliche idyllische Haltung fern.[3] In ihrem Referat "Idylle" im *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte* behauptet im gleichen Sinne Erna Merker: "Der zunehmende Wirklichkeitssinn des 19. Jahrhunderts drängt zur ländlichen Kleinmalerei der Bauerngeschichte und sozialtendenziösen Darstellung landwirtschaftlicher Entwicklungskrisen . . . führt aber mit alledem mehr und mehr von dem idealistischen Geiste alter Idyllendichtung ab." Sie meint, daß "das weitere 19. Jahrhundert weder eine Weiterentwicklung der Gattung, noch irgendwie besondere Einzelleistungen in den alten Bahnen hervorbringt," und ignoriert dabei völlig nicht nur die von ihr überhaupt nicht genannten Hartmann, Hebbel, Heyse, Seidel, Spitteler, Stieler, Widmann, sondern auch die Ergebnisse des in ihrer Bibliographie verzeichneten Werkes von Knögel, dessen Titel allein ihrer Behauptung widerspricht.[4]

[1] Theobald Ziegler, *Studien und Studienköpfe aus der neueren und neuesten Literaturgeschichte* (1877), S. 42.

[2] Gustav Schneider, *Über das Wesen und den Entwicklungsgang der Idylle* (Progr. Wilh. Gymn., Hamburg, 1893), S. 34.

[3] *Sachwörterbuch der Deutschkunde*, I (1930), 568.

[4] W. Knögel, *Voß' Luise und die Entwicklung der deutschen Idylle bis auf Heinrich Seidel* (Progr. Frankfurt am Main, 1904).

Wie bei jeder Untersuchung über eine literarische Gattung erhebt sich auch bei der Idylle die schwierige Frage der Abgrenzung der Gattung. Erna Merker beschreibt im *Reallexikon* die Idylle folgendermaßen:

Idylle ist ein kleines in sich abgeschlossenes literarisches Genrebild, welches einfache menschliche Verhältnisse fern vom öffentlichen bewegten Leben im engen Zusammenhang mit der Natur schildert und dabei einfache, gutartige Charaktere in behaglich glücklichen Lebensverhältnissen heiter und nicht selten humorvoll zur Darstellung bringt.

Diese Definition ist unleugbar sehr sorgfältig formuliert, muß aber doch nur etwa einer Beschreibung der Tragödie gleichgesetzt werden, die nichts über die Tragik sagt. Dazu kommt natürlich noch der unvermeidliche Umstand, daß ähnliche literarhistorische Definitionen der lebens-, kunst-, und darum widerspruchsvollen Wirklichkeit gegenüber nur vag und plump erscheinen und oft daher einfach nicht genügen.

Trotz aller Definition bleiben die Grenzen der Idylle gegenüber anderen Gattungen nicht selten schwankend. Ist der *Oberhof* Immermanns eine Dorfgeschichte oder eine Idylle, ist Goethes "Alexis und Dora" eine Idylle oder eine Elegie? Darüber gehen die Meinungen nicht ohne Grund auseinander. Man kann im *Oberhof* eine Dorfgeschichte sehen, wenn man vor allem den Hofschulzen und seine Sphäre ins Blickfeld rückt, man kann aber auch den *Oberhof* als ein Idyll im *Münchhausen*, oder das Verhältnis zwischen Oswald und Lisbeth als ein Idyll im *Oberhof*[5] oder eine bestimmte Episode als ein Idyll in diesem Verhältnis ansehen.[6] "Alexis und Dora" wird etwa von Koberstein nach Inhalt und Form zur Elegie gerechnet,[7] von Theobald Ziegler aber als Idylle bezeichnet.[8]

Oft gibt allerdings der Dichter selbst sein Werk als Idylle aus, im Inneren (Heyse in der *Hochzeitsreise an den Walchensee,*[9] Widmann im *Bin, der Schwärmer,*[10] Hartmann in *Adam und Eva*[11]), am Ende (Maler Müller in der *Schafschur,* Stieler im *Winteridyll,* Widmann im *Bin*), oder endlich, was natürlich der gewöhnliche Fall ist, im Titel oder Untertitel. In der Tat führen die weitaus meisten idyllischen Dichtungen die Bezeichnung "Idylle" oder eine entsprechende. Allein die Benennung "Idylle" fehlt oft oder ist durch eine andere, un-

[5] Im 8. Buch, 4. Kapitel, wird diese Liebe auch vom Autor idyllisch genannt (*Immermanns Werke,* hg. H. Maync, II, 364).

[6] "Eine Idylle in Feld und Busch" (5. Buch, 8. Kapitel).

[7] August Koberstein, *Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur* vom zweiten Viertel des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts bis zu Goethes Tod (1873), V, 167.

[8] Nach Fritz Strich (*Deutsche Klassik und Romantik,* 2. Aufl., [1924], S. 21) ist es ein "tragisches Idyll," nach Goethe selbst ursprünglich eine Idylle (z. B. im Brief an Körner vom 22. 9. 1796 und im Brief an Schiller vom 22. 6. 1796).

[9] *Ges. Werke,* III/2 (1879), 137, 138, 151, 155, 164, 171.

[10] J. V. Widmann, *Bin, der Schwärmer,* 4. Aufl. (1913), S. 15: "Die Wirklichkeit berichtet dies Idyll."

[11] Moritz Hartmann, *Gesammelte Werke,* II (1874), 251.

bestimmte, etwa "Gedicht" (*Mutter und Kind.* Ein Gedicht in sieben Gesängen) ersetzt. Überdies ist sie selbst erst auf ihre Richtigkeit zu prüfen.

Wenn auch der Dichter selbst sein Werk als Idyll bezeichnet, so gewährt er damit nur einen Anhaltspunkt, nicht eine endgültige Feststellung, denn dichterische Selbstdefinition darf nicht kritiklos von der Wissenschaft übernommen werden. So ist Mörikes "Waldidylle" bestimmt kein Idyll, denn als solches kann trotz Mörike, Wiegand,[12] und anderen nicht ein kurzes Gedicht bezeichnet werden, in dem inmitten der Wiedergabe einer einfachen Handlung mit ganz wenigen Worten dem Gedanken oder dem Traum an ein mögliches oder, wenn man will, unmögliches idyllisches Glück Ausdruck gegeben wird. Hugo von Hofmannsthals "Idylle" kann sogar als eine Art tragischer Anti-Idylle aufgefaßt werden. Hier will ja eine Frau aus der kleinbürgerlichen Enge und ihren idyllischen Möglichkeiten in die leidenschaftlich lockende Ferne entfliehen und wird von ihrem Mann ermordet.

Besonders umstritten ist die Grenze gegenüber der Dorfgeschichte.[13] Hier seien nur einige Bemerkungen zum Problem Idylle—Dorfgeschichte gestattet.

"Die Dorfgeschichte spielt im Dorf und handelt von Bauern."[14] Im Gegensatz zur Idylle hält sich also die echte Dorfgeschichte streng an das bäuerliche Lokal und betrachtet alles Geschehen immer nur aus dieser Perspektive.[15] Die Dorfgeschichte betont die sozialen Unterschiede, die Idylle betont das allen Menschen Gemeinsame. In der Dorfgeschichte werden die Grenzen zwischen den Ständen, zwischen Fremden und Einheimischen, zwischen Stadt und Land scharf gesehen und gezogen, in der Idylle werden sie aufgehoben. In ständischer Sonderentwicklung erblickt der Hofschulze Immermanns das Heil. Die Liebe des Dichters von *Mutter und Kind* hingegen gilt der Beschreibung eines Familienglücks, das alle gleich macht, "alle Sphären verbindet und alle Wesen vereinigt."[16]

Die Gestalten der Dorfgeschichte haben etwas Erdgeborenes, Erdnahes, Erdverwurzeltes. Die der Idylle sind oft Menschen der Stadt und der Welt, die im Erdhaften erst Wurzel fassen wollen. "Die Dorfgeschichte ist im wesentlichen Gemeinschaftsdichtung . . . Stammestum und Landschaft weisen der Dorfgeschichte ihren jeweils besonderen Raum zu."[17] Falls der Schwerpunkt der Idylle nicht im (selig in sich ruhenden) Einzelmenschen liegt, was eigentlich der

---

[12] J. Wiegand, *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*, 2. Aufl. (1928), S. 345.

[13] Auch Friedrich Altvater, *Wesen und Form der deutschen Dorfgeschichte* (*Germ. Studien*, 88 [1930]), schuf hier nicht die wünschenswerte Klarheit.

[14] Altvater, S. 13, erklärt dies für die "einzige Feststellung, die wir für die gesamte Dorfepik machen können."

[15] Schon deshalb kann kaum von einer "Dorfdichtung des Rokoko" gesprochen werden (Karl Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, XI [1908], 246).

[16] V. 1420.

[17] Altvater, S. 16 f.

Idealfall ist, mag sie sich wohl um eine Gemeinschaft drehen, aber in der Regel ist diese dem Umfange nach kleiner als in der Dorfgeschichte. Es handelt sich dann um eine bloße Sprech (Plauder)- oder Muße- oder Rast- oder Arbeitsgemeinschaft (im letzen Fall ist es immer Arbeit leichterer Art) oder um eine Liebes-, Ehe-, oder Familiengemeinschaft. Wohl ist für einige epische Idyllen die Volksgemeinschaft von Bedeutung, aber hierin ist nur ein rein episches Element zu erblicken.

Die Störung des Gleichgewichts durch Leidenschaften und Schicksalsschläge tritt in der Dorfgeschichte weit öfter ein als in der Idylle. Die eventuellen "flüchtigen Schmerzen vollenden" nur "das Glück" der Idylle,[18] und bahnen nur einen "längeren Weg sicher zum schöneren Ziel."[19] Pädagogische Tendenzen sind nur für die Dorfgeschichte charakteristisch. "Die Moral allein unterscheidet uns von dem Vieh," verkündet gelegentlich Immermanns Hofschulze in feierlicher Weise.[20]

Während der Begriff der Idylle von dem Begriff der Muße nicht zu trennen ist, ist in der Dorfgeschichte Arbeit das Um und Auf. Hier nur sind solche Gestalten möglich wie der Hofschulze, der im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes nie etwas umsonst tut.[21] Die Dorfgeschichte sucht das Bauernvolk bei seiner Arbeit auf, die Idylle sucht einige Menschen in ihrer Ruhe auf, die sie selbst aufsuchen.

Aber im Grund sind diese angeführten Punkte ebenso wie die Definition E. Merkers nur allgemeine Beschreibungen äußerer Kennzeichen, die verwickeltem und tiefem Sachverhalt ohnmächtig gegenüberstehen. Schon Wilhelm von Humboldt erkannte bei der Untersuchung des "Unterschiedes zwischen der Epopöe und der Idylle" die Unmöglichkeit, die Idylle aus rein äußeren Kriterien eindeutig zu definieren.[22] Auch er hatte zunächst die Idylle stofflich festzulegen versucht,[23] er sah aber bald, daß man, "um auf völlig bestimmte Grenzen zu kommen, einen anderen und mehr methodischen Weg einschlagen müsse," und betrat auch in der Tat den einzig gangbaren, indem er von der Doppelbedeutung des Wortes Idylle ausgehend sich von dem idyllischen Gehalt leiten ließ.

Was Wilhelm von Humboldt zur Unterscheidung von Epos und Idyll bemerkt, kann und muß verallgemeinert werden. Geht man aber einmal erst von der fundamentalen Wichtigkeit der idyllischen Stimmung aus und erkennt, daß nur diese der Idylle Sinn und Namen gibt, dann ist es auch unmöglich anzunehmen, daß die Idylle irgendwie

[18] Goethe, *Hermann und Dorothea*, IX, 213 f.
[19] Hebbel, *Mutter und Kind*, V. 1814.
[20] *Immermanns Werke*, I, 221.
[21] *Ebenda*, 211. "Gemütlich sind die Bauern gar nicht. . . . Die Leute haben keine Zeit zum Gemüt. Gemüt kann man nur haben, wenn man wenig zu tun hat; der Bauer aber muß sich zu viel placken und schinden, um sich auf das Gemüt legen zu können." (*Ebenda*, II, 66.)
[22] W. v. Humboldt, *Ästhetische Versuche über Goethes Hermann und Dorothea*, 4. Aufl. (1882), S. 135 f.
[23] *Ebenda*, S. 115 f.

oder irgendwann "ersetzt" wurde oder ersetzt werden könne. Was insbesondere die Dorfgeschichte betrifft: "Der frische Duft der Ackerfurche allein kann den arkadischen Hauch nicht ersetzen," bemerkt schon Gottschall treffend in seiner *Poetik*.[24]

Wenn nicht traditionsgebundene Stoffe und Formen eindeutig sprechen, entscheidet also in allen Fällen letzten Endes über die Zugehörigkeit zur Idylle das Gefühl des Idyllischen, das man als Kategorie wie das Tragische und das Komische fassen kann. Jean Paul, der feinsinnigste Theoretiker der Idylle (wie Schiller der kühnste), beschreibt die Idylle als "epische Darstellung des Vollglücks in der Beschränkung."[25] Das Gefühl des Idyllischen ist nun, um es kurz anzudeuten, nicht so sehr Freude in der Beschränkung, als Freude an der Enge, nicht trotz der Enge.

Die idyllische Stimmung kann nun nicht einer bestimmten Dichtungsgattung ausschließlich oder auch nur vorzugsweise zugeordnet werden. Die Idylle ist überall und nirgends zu Hause. Wohl kann sie lyrisch, episch und dramatisch sein, aber eben darum ist sie keines von den dreien. Dies mögen einige Gegensatzpaare illustrieren. Am Anfang der Lyrik steht das Wort, in der Mitte der Idylle das Gespräch. Die Lyrik geht in die Tiefe und in die Höhe, die Idylle in die Breite (sie ist ein Bild, wenn auch ein Bildchen). Für das Epos ist die Volkstradition, für das Idyll aber nur die literarische Tradition von Bedeutung. Der Held des Epos ist ein Volk, die Menschheit, oder ihre großen Persönlichkeiten. Der Held des Idylls ist ein Privatmensch, oder eine kleinere Gemeinschaft. Das Epos hat keine engen Grenzen, was Umfang, Personenzahl und Dauer betrifft. Die Idylle, das Bildchen, steht im Zeichen der Beschränkung auch in formaler Hinsicht. Das Epos ist mythisch und historisch, der Schauplatz der Idylle ist die Wirklichkeit und die Gegenwart. Im Epos herrscht Bewegung, in der Idylle Ruhe. Das Epos ist heroisch, die Idylle aheroisch. Im Mittelpunkt des Dramas, um zur dritten Dichtungsgattung zu kommen, steht ein Konflikt. Für die Idylle hingegen ist die Reibungslosigkeit kennzeichnend. Dem dramatischen Dialog steht das idyllische Gespräch gegenüber.[26]

Trotz oder wegen des unidyllischen Charakters des modernen Lebens ist idyllische Stimmung lebendig geblieben und bietet die neue deutsche Idyllik trotz aller gegenteiligen Versicherungen ein buntes, lebendiges und anziehendes Bild, oder, wenn man will, Bildchen.

[24] Rudolf Gottschall, *Poetik*, 2. Aufl. (1870), II, 146.

[25] Jean Paul, *Vorschule der Ästhetik*, hg. Jos. Müller ("Philosoph. Bibliothek," 105), S. 268.

[26] Idylle ist nach Erwin Rohde "Poesie der Empfindung," Drama ist "Poesie der Tat." (Zitiert bei Knögel, *a.a.O.*, S. 42.)

II

Was den Inhalt der deutschen Idyllen betrifft, so handelt es sich in der überwiegenden Mehrzahl der Fälle um die Vereinigung eines Liebespaares. Dies gilt namentlich vom epischen Idyll, wie die folgende Aufzählung beweist: Voßens *Luise,* Goethes und Saars *Hermann und Dorothea,* Baggesens *Parthenais,* Usteris *De Vikari,* Corrodis *De Herr Professer,* Eberhards *Hannchen und die Küchlein,* Eberts *Das Kloster,* Hartmanns *Adam und Eva,* Kosegartens *Jucunde* und *Inselfahrt,* Mörikes *Idylle vom Bodensee,* Widmanns *An den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen.*

Die Liebenden sind durchwegs ideal gezeichnet. Das Mädchen ist immer schön, klug, arbeitsam, treu usw. In mehreren Idyllen steht es verwaist und allein, doch mutig und selbständig in der Welt, wie die Dorothea Goethes und Saars, die Magda in Hebbels *Mutter und Kind,* die Lisbeth in Immermans *Oberhof* und die Lenore in Widmanns *An den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen.* In einigen Idyllen wird es vor der Verfolgung durch einen fremden Mann von seinem späteren Verlobten in Schutz genommen, was das Liebesverhältnis einleitet: *Mutter und Kind,* "Der neue Pausias," *De Herr Professer* (Corrodi), *Adam und Eva.* Viele Idyllen haben die Schnelligkeit der Verbindung zwischen den Liebenden gemeinsam. Man kann geradezu sagen: Die Menschen der Idylle lassen sich Zeit, nur zur Verlobung nicht.[27]

Unter den Idyllen, in denen die Liebe nicht in den Vordergrund tritt, nehmen die lebensbeschreibenden einen größeren Raum in Anspruch; sie sind fast durchwegs in Ich-Form. Meist blickt das Ich auf sein Leben zurück, die Form ist lyrisch, in der Regel zerfällt das Gedicht in Einzelbildchen (Idylle bedeutet ursprünglich Bildchen. Ich halte an dieser Etymologie fest und nicht am "kleinen Gedicht"). Eine solche biographisch-lyrische Dichtung nenne ich biolyrische Idylle oder idyllische Revue. Hierzu rechne ich Mörikes "Der alte Turmhahn," Stielers *Winteridyll,* Meyers *Huttens letzte Tage,* Liliencrons *Poggfred* und Drostes "Des alten Pfarrers Woche."

In einer dritten größeren Gruppe von Idyllen bildet bei wechselndem Inhalt ein Gespräch den Stoff. Das Gespräch, in diesem Fall auch Form, ist in der Mehrzahl der Fälle ein Zwiegespräch. Eine solche Dichtung nenne ich Gesprächsidylle (Im allgemeinen spricht man von einer Idylle in "dramatischer Form." Sie ist schon bei Theokrit vertreten). Fast die Hälfte der Idyllen Geßners sind Gespräche. Das Gespräch ist ferner formbildend bei dem Fischeridylliker Bronner, bei Ewald von Kleist, bei Voß, bei Maler Müller in den antiken Idyllen und in den Heimatidyllen, bei Goethe im "Neuen Pausias," bei Platen ("Hirte und Winzerin," "Scylla und

[27] Vergleiche meinen Artikel, "Analyse des Idyllischen," *Psychoanalytische Bewegung,* V (1933), 176 f.

der Reisende"), bei Caroline Pichler, Albert Moeser und Otto Roquette.

Das Gespräch ist in der Idylle darum so häufig, weil es darin Entspannung und auch ein wenig Sammlung bedeutet, und also zu ihrem Wesen gehört, weil es ein geselliger, behaglicher, unschuldiger, weil es der einfachste Zeitvertreib ist. "Plaudern wir!" ist eine Aufforderung, die bei Roquette sehr häufig wiederkehrt. Sie ist das "Ergo bibamus" seiner Idyllen. Auch in jenen Idyllen, die nicht eigentlich zu dieser Gruppe gehören, findet das Gespräch eine eigentümliche Verwendung, die fast eine Tradition darstellt. Der Dichter selbst unterhält sich mitten in seiner Dichtung mit den Lesern oder Hörern (dies gilt insbesondere von der Schweizer Idyllik), mit Personen (Voß und die Nachfolger), ja Formen seiner Dichtung, wie namentlich dem zu wählenden oder gewählten Vers und der Muse oder schließlich mit einem Freund (Heyse). Um die Idyllik schärfer von der Lyrik zu trennen, konnten wir daher den Satz wagen: Am Anfang der Lyrik ist das Wort, in der Mitte der Idylle das Gespräch.

Auch die Idylle hat ihren Gehalt an "Erlebnis" (ich meine jetzt persönliches Erleben, Schicksal des Dichters). Besonders reichen Erlebnisgehalt weisen natürlich Idyllen vom Schlage des *Winteridylls* und *Poggfreds* auf. Mörikes "Turmhahn" steht nicht weit zurück. Die Idyllen des Freiherrn von Münchhausen und Pontens *Römisches Idyll* (beide auch in der Autor-Ich-Form) stellen einzelne Abschnitte oder Episoden aus dem Leben ihrer Verfasser dar.

Baggesens *Parthenais,* die zunächst klassizistisch lebensfremd dünkt, fußt auf seiner Schweizer Reise und, wie der Dichter Nordfrank (der Name spricht wie der Beruf), liebte und heiratete er ein Mädchen aus dem Berner Land. *Mutter und Kind* geht auf Hebbels Gmundner Erlebnis zurück. Die Quelle für *Wuz* ist des Dichters eigene Jugend (die Joditzer und Schwarzenbacher Idylle); Augustine Römer, Jean Pauls erste Liebe, gab den Namen zur Justel her, auch seine zweite Liebe stand Modell. Ein Jugendfreund Seidels ist das Modell des Leberecht Hühnchen, auf den auch Züge anderer Personen, die in dem Leben des Dichters eine Rolle gespielt haben, übertragen sind.[28] Was Hölderlins "Emilie vor ihrem Brauttag" betrifft, so ist "diese kleine Idylle durch und durch Erlebnis."[29] Thomas Mann ist im *Gesang vom Kindchen* in einem Maße persönlich wie sonst kaum irgendwo, und gibt fast eine Autobiographie. Starke Anklänge an das Leben ihrer Verfasser weisen ferner "Der neue Pausias," Voßens "Elbfahrt," "Siebzigster Geburtstag" und *Luise,* Spittelers *Gustav* und Widmanns *Bin, der Schwärmer* auf.

Der innige Zusammenhang, der oft mit dem persönlichen Erleben des Dichters besteht, kommt auch darin zum Ausdruck, daß fast

---

[28] Knögel, S. 34.

[29] Emil Lehmann, *Hölderlins Idylle Emilie vor ihrem Brauttag* ("Prager deutsche Studien," 35 [1925]), S. 21.

alle Idyllen in der Heimat ihres Verfassers spielen, also Heimatidyllen sind.[30]

III

Von der Besprechung des Inhalts der Idylle seit Geßner wenden wir uns den formalen Fragen zu, die wir anläßlich der Gesprächsidylle schon berührt haben. Offenbar dauert eine Gesprächsidylle nur die Zeit eines Gesprächs, die kurze Dauer ist jedoch für die Idylle überhaupt charakteristisch. Das hängt natürlich mit der Tendenz zur Enge ("Beschränkung" Jean Pauls) zusammen. Bei den biographischen Idyllen ("Turmhahn," *Winteridyll, Wuz*) ist unter Dauer jene der idyllischen Situation zu verstehen, aus der heraus das Leben zur Erinnerung oder Darstellung kommt.

Was den Rahmen, das geschichtliche und soziale Milieu der Idylle betrifft, so fehlen nicht Revolutionen und Kriege, namentlich nicht im idyllischen Epos. Sie sind Folie und Begründung des glücklichen Lebens in der Enge.[31] In der überwiegenden Mehrzahl der Kriegsfälle in den deutschen Idyllen handelt es sich, wie nicht anders zu erwarten, um Franzosenkriege: *De Vikari, Adam und Eva, Das Kloster, An den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen, Hermann und Dorothea, Jucunde, Hannchen und die Küchlein, Der Bodenseher* (Finckh), *Gesang vom Kindchen, Römisches Idyll.*

Aber auch von Kriegen abgesehen nimmt die Idylle, keineswegs "enge" in dieser Hinsicht, reichlich Bezug auf große Ereignisse und Persönlichkeiten ihrer Gegenwart. Unter anderen werden in der *Luise* Mendelssohn, Bürger, Claudius, Hölty, Voß selbst, Angelika Kaufmann, Reichardt, Gluck, Washington, Franklin erwähnt, in *Hermann und Dorothea* die Zauberflöte, in der *Schafschur* Maler Müllers die "zeitgenössischen Idyllen" (offenbar Geßner), in seinem *Nußkernen* die *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek,* in Kosegartens *Jucunde* (1803), Goethe, Schiller (*Tell*), Campe, Salzmann, in Eberhards *Hannchen* (1822) Beethoven, in Platens "Einladung nach der Insel Palmaria" (1828 enstanden) der Tod Shelleys (1822), in der *Parthenais* das nur einige Jahre zurückliegende Erscheinen der *Propyläen* Goethes und der Homerübersetzung Voßens, im *Wuz* Lavater, die *Räuber,* Kants *Kritik der reinen Vernunft,* Campe, in Widmanns *An den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen* (1876) Anselm Feuerbach, im *Poggfred* Dehmel und Liliencron selbst, in Seidels *Hühnchen* Wilhelm Busch, im *Winteridyll* Heyse, im *Römischen Idyll* Pontens Gerhart Hauptmann, in Finckhs *Bodenseher* Theodor Herzl.

Die Zeit der Idylle ist überhaupt fast ausschließlich die der Gegen-

[30] "Analyse des Idyllischen," S. 183 f.
[31] "Analyse des Idyllischen," S. 177-79.

wart des Dichters. Ich verweise hier auf den Gegensatz zwischen idyllischer und romantischer Dichtung.[32]

Bei der Betrachtung des zeitlichen Milieus zeigt sich, daß das goldene Zeitalter auch für die Idylle endgültig vorbei ist. Bei der Untersuchung des sozialen Milieus ergibt sich, daß auch eine zweite Regel der Idyllenpoetik des frühen 18. Jahrhunderts, die Beschränkung auf die Schäferwelt, nach Geßner völlig gefallen ist. "Die Wahl des Standes der Mitspieler steht frei, sobald nur dadurch nicht die Bedingung des Vollglücks in Beschränkung verliert," erklärt auch schon Jean Paul in der *Vorschule der Ästhetik*.[33] Goethe aber hat mit gutem Blick d e n Stand der Idylle nach Geßner erkannt: "Ein protestantischer Landgeistlicher ist vielleicht der schönste Gegenstand einer modernen Idylle."[34] Tatsächlich scheint der Seelenhirt den Schafhirt abgelöst zu haben. Jedenfalls spielen viele Idyllen in einem oder um ein Pfarrhaus: *Luise*, "Der siebzigste Geburtstag," Sesenheimer Idyll, *Jucunde, De Vikari, Hannchen*, "Der alte Turmhahn," *Gustav* (Spitteler), *An den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen* (das auch den Untertitel "Pfarrhausidyll" führt), *Bin, der Schwärmer*, Idyllen von Crusius, Kirsch, Heinel, Holzapfel, Kannegießer, Henriette Corrodi. Auf katholischer Seite steht "Des alten Pfarrers Woche" der Droste. Zu beachten ist, daß mehrere Idyllendichter selbst Pfarrer waren: Hebel, Mörike, Crusius, Breitenstein, Heinel. Auch ein katholischer Geistlicher, der niederösterreichische Piaristenpriester Josef Misson, gehört zu den Idyllendichtern.

Immerhin kommen auch Hirten in der modernen Idylle vor, namentlich unter dem Einfluß der Antike. Bei Baggesen, dessen *Parthenais* im "idyllischen Lande Geßners," wie es im Epos selbst heißt,[35] spielt, kommt auch die Einwirkung Geßners hinzu. Bei Roquette ist der Hirtenstand in den "Naturstimmen" und in "Pans Grotte" vertreten. Ich erwähne ferner die Idylle "Hirte und Winzerin" von Platen, das "Lied des Ziegenhirten" ("Lied eines theokritischen Ziegenhirten") in Nietzches "Liedern des Prinzen Vogelfrei" ("Idyllen aus Messina"), die Sennerin in Stielers *Winteridyll* ("Im Dialekt"), die Rast der Götter unter dem Hesperidenbaum in Gesellschaft der als Hirtin gewandeten Hebe und die Geschichte des Hirten Utis, die ich als Symbol der Idylle auffasse, in Spittelers *Olympischem Frühling*, den Helden in Finckhs *Bodenseher*, der im Schafstall zur Welt kommt, die Schafe seine "blökenden Geschwister" nennt, und dessen Vater Hirte ist, den Schäfer in Finckhs *Rapunzel* und Brandenburgs Idylle *Pankraz, der Hirtenbub*.

Die Frage des sozialen Milieus in der modernen Idylle führt uns zur Frage des Dialekts in der Idylle. Die Wahl der Personen unter

---

[32] Vergleiche meinen Artikel "Vom Wesen der deutschen Idylle," *Germanic Review*, XXII (1947), 212. Idyllen, die nicht in der Gegenwart spielen, sind in der "Analyse des Idyllischen," S. 185, erwähnt.

[33] *A.a.O.*, S. 272.

[34] *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, 2. Teil, 10. Buch.

[35] Jens Baggesen, *Parthenais oder die Alpenreise* (1819), II, 90-91.

den niederen Ständen hat bei der realistischen Tendenz und der ungezwungenen, heiteren Geselligkeit, die der Idylle eigentümlich sind, dem Dialekt in der Idylle leichter und früher als in jeder anderen Dichtungsgattung Eingang zu verschaffen gewußt. Der Dialekt tritt schon bei Theokrit ("Die Syrakuserinnen am Adonisfest"), später in portugiesischen Schäfergedichten auf.[36] Der Dialekt in den Idyllen Voßens und Hebels ist von grundlegender Bedeutung für die deutsche Dialektliteratur überhaupt. Die Schweizer Hexameteridyllen im Anschluß an Hebel sind alle im Dialekt verfaßt. Die Einführung des Dialekts in die Idylle hängt jedoch nicht nur mit dem sozialen Milieu der auftretenden Personen, sondern zum Teil auch mit dem sozialen Milieu der Leser zusammen. Voß und Hebel wollten von den unteren Ständen gelesen werden. Sie glaubten mit der Idylle, die man die Tanagrafigur unter den literarischen Gattungen nennen könnte, den gleichen Zweck zu erreichen, den sich der Erfinder der Tanagraplastik in Kinkels Idyll vorsetzt:

> Hier ist gesorgt, daß auch der arme Mann,
> Wenn heim vom Feld er bringt die schwere Garbe,
> Beim eignen Herde nicht der Anmut darbe.[37]

Der Dialekt empfahl sich ihnen daher auch von dieser Seite her.

Die heitere Vertraulichkeit, die Gemütlichkeit, die in der Idylle im Bereich des Sprachlichen zur Verwendung der Mundart geführt hat, ist auch sonst formal für die Idylle von Bedeutung. Sie öffnet die Schranken, die in den andern Gattungen gewöhnlich zwischen dem Dichter und den Personen seiner Dichtung, zwischen dem Dichter und dem Leser, und schließlich zwischen dem Dichter und seinen Vorgängern in der betreffenden Gattung bestehen. In der Enge der Idylle kann man nicht Distanz halten.

Usteri z. B. erzählt den *Vikari* in ständigem Kontakt mit dem Leser. Auch Corrodi wendet sich in seinem *Professer* zu wiederholten Malen an den Leser. Desgleichen hat Hebbel den "gemütvollen Zug, sich durch die Anrede mit dem Leser in vertrautere Beziehung zu setzen,"[38] ebenso Hartmann,[39] Ponten,[40] Liliencron,[41] und Jean Paul.[42]

Daß der Dichter sich mit dem Leser auf gleichen Fuß stellt, führt auch dazu, daß er ihn in seine sonst nicht allgemein zugängliche Werkstatt führt oder sich von ihm bei der Arbeit über die Schulter blicken läßt. Die Dichtung entsteht so vor unseren Augen. Das

---

[36] Gustav Schneider, *Über das Wesen und den Entwicklungsgang der Idylle* (Hamburg, 1893), S. 32.

[37] Gottfr. Kinkel, *Tanagra*, 3. Aufl. (1886), S. 41.

[38] Fritz Enss, *Hebbels Epos "Mutter und Kind,"* Diss. Marburg a.d.L. (1909), S. 85.

[39] Moritz Hartmann, *Ges. W.*, II (1874), 312.

[40] Josef Ponten, *Römisches Idyll* (1927), S. 9 f.

[41] Detl. v. Liliencron, *Ges. W.*, hg. R. Dehmel, I, 18.

[42] *DNL*, 150, S. 273, 285-86, 297.

geschieht im "Weihnachtsfest" Münchhausens[43] und in Hartmanns *Adam und Eva.*[44] Zu vergleichen ist ferner der "Vorsatz" im *Gesang vom Kindchen,* in dem Thomas Mann vom Dichten, von seinen bisherigen metrischen Versuchen, vom Hexameter usw. spricht, und die *Chronik der Sperlinggasse,* in der Raabe die Handlungsführung diskutiert.[45] Besonders zahlreiche Belege finden sich jedoch im *Wuz,*[46] in Heyses *Hochzeitsreise an den Walchensee,* die geradezu ein Stegreifidyll ist,[47] und im *Poggfred,* wo solches ungezwungene Verfahren an die äußerste Grenze getrieben wird.[48]

Der Dichter spricht oft die Personen seines Werkes wie gute Freunde an, er nimmt von ihnen am Schlusse der Dichtung Abschied. Besonders innig ist die Beziehung des Dichters des *Wuz* zu seiner Hauptgestalt.[49] Voß hat die Anrede an Personen der Dichtung zu einem stehenden Formelement gemacht, das bei allen seinen Nachfolgern, insbesondere Kosegarten wiederkehrt.[50] Beispiele finden sich auch in der *Idylle vom Bodensee,*[51] in Widmanns *An den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen,* in Corrodis *De Herr Professer* und in Heyses *Hochzeitsreise.*[52]

Nicht nur zu seinen Lesern und zu den Menschen seiner Dichtung, sondern auch zu seinen Vorgängern hat der Dichter der Idylle, wie ich schon sagte, ein eigentümliches inniges Verhältnis. Gerade darum trägt er oft keine Scheu, Anleihen aus ihren Werken zu machen, seine Dichtung in ihrem Zeichen zu gestalten. Diese Einbeziehung eines früheren Idyllikers oder eines früheren Idylls in das eigene Idyll nenne ich kurz "Idyll im Idyll." Sie kommt am häufigsten durch die Nennung und kurze günstige Beurteilung des Vorgängers zum Ausdruck. Im Sesenheimer Idyll liegen die Verhältnisse wie im *Landprediger von Wakefield,* was ausdrücklich erwähnt wird.[53] Einzelne Personen erhalten vom Dichter, gewissermaßen vor unseren Augen, die Namen der entsprechenden Gestalten aus dem englischen Werke (Moses, Olivie).[54] Das Musterbeispiel für ein "Idyll im Idyll" liefert jedoch Saars *Hermann und Dorothea.* Hier kann man geradezu von *Hermann und Dorothea* in *Hermann und Dorothea* sprechen.[55]

---

[43] Börries Fr. v. Münchhausen, *Idyllen* (1935), S. 46.
[44] Moritz Hartmann, *Ges. W.*, II, 268.
[45] W. Raabe, *Die Chronik der Sperlinggasse* (1912), S. 92.
[46] *DNL,* 150, S. 286, 296, 298, 299, 302.
[47] Paul Heyse, *Ges. W.*, III/2 (1879), 139, 140, 143, 144, 151, 155, 159.
[48] Liliencron, *a.a.O.*, S. 17, 20, 23, 66, 119, 131, 171, 191, 192, 219, 240, 319, 323, 325.
[49] Jean Paul, *Werke,* I (*DNL,* 150), 273, 283, 285, 300, 301.
[50] L. G. Kosegarten, *Dichtungen* (1824), II, 48, 127; III, 59.
[51] Ed. Mörike, *Idylle vom Bodensee,* V. 628, 714, 1363.
[52] Heyse, *a.a.O.*, S. 139, 159.
[53] *Dichtung und Wahrheit,* II/10.
[54] Vergleiche in Widmanns Idyll *Bin* (1913), S. 22:

Diotima,
Den Namen borgen wir bei Hölderlin.

[55] Goethes Werk ist nicht nur Vorbild für Namensgebung, Motive, Handlungsführung, Charakterzeichnung, Umweltschilderung und Tendenz, sondern es

Ein ähnliches "Idyll im Idyll" bietet Hartmanns *Adam und Eva,* das, wie schon aus dem Titel hervorgeht, auf das biblische Idyll im Paradies Bezug nimmt.[56]

Die Namen oder die Werke früherer Idylliker werden in der Idylle oft genannt.[57] Ein interessanter Spezialfall findet sich in der *Inselfahrt* Kosegartens. Hier tritt eine frühere Idylle in der späteren Idylle desselben Autors auf.[58] Manchmal ist auch von den Idyllendichtern im allgemeinen die Rede, wie bei Seidel[59] und in der *Schafschur,* hier allerdings, was sonst nur gelegentlich im *Oberhof* vorkommt,[60] mit polemischer Absicht.[61]

Ein banaler Fall von "Idyll im Idyll" ist die Verwendung des Wortes "Idylle" selbst und seiner Ableitungen oder seiner Synonyma in der Idylle. Da in solchen Fällen die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Wortes als poetische Gattung oft noch empfunden wird, schließt sich dieser Fall unmittelbar an den eben besprochenen an. Besonders reichen Gebrauch macht Kosegartens *Inselfahrt* von diesem "Idyll im Idyll."[62] Sonst kommt das Wort Idylle noch bei Baggesen,[63] Hartmann,[64] Heyse,[65] Stieler,[66] Seidel,[67] Liliencron,[68] Nietzsche[69] und Ponten vor.[70]

In drei Werken steht das Wort Idyll am Schluß, wobei es nicht ein Objekt in der Dichtung, sondern die Dichtung selbst bezeichnet, die Dichtung selbst (das eben Erlebte) zum Objekt hat. Der eine Fall findet sich in der *Schafschur*:

> Aber Herr Gevatter Schulmeister, sag er, könnte man nicht aus dem Dings da all miteinander (gemeint ist das eben Vorgefallene, was wieder gleichbedeutend ist mit Müllers Werk) eine vortreffliche Idylle machen? Das müßte eine rechte, wahre, gute Idylle geben.[71]

Der andere in Stielers *Winteridyll,* das mit folgenden Worten schließt: "Was ich erlebte? . . . Nichts. Nur ein Idyll." Der dritte in Widmanns *Bin,* der mit folgenden Versen endet:

---

tritt auch unmittelbar auf. Es wird (wie der *Landprediger* im Sesenheimer Idyll) vorgelesen, sein Inhalt kurz angegeben, sein Versmaß und sein Ethos gekennzeichnet und acht Zeilen werden zitiert.

[56] "Analyse des Idyllischen," S. 182-83.

[57] *Ebenda,* S. 183.

[58] L.Th. Kosegarten, *Dichtungen,* III, 99.

[59] Heinr. Seidel, *Leberecht Hühnchen,* Gesamtausg. (1928), S. 63.

[60] *Immermanns Werke,* hg. Mayne, I, 269 f.

[61] Friedrich Müller, *Werke,* I (1811), 232 f.

[62] So liest man darin etwa "arkadisches Frühmahl," "arkadischer Frohsinn," "elysische Ruh," "edenische Unschuld." Die Wohnung Isores ist ein "Asyl idyllischer Ruh und bukolischer Einfalt." (*Dichtungen,* III, 41, 42, 90, 101.)

[63] *Parthenais,* II, 121.

[64] *Ges. W.,* II, 251.

[65] *Ges. W.,* III/2, 151.

[66] Karl Stieler, *Ein Winter-Idyll* (1898), S. 36.

[67] *Leberecht Hühnchen,* S. 63.

[68] Liliencron, *a.a.O.,* S. 227.

[69] "Im Süden": "Idylle rings, Geblök von Schafen."

[70] J. Ponten, *a.a.O.,* S. 64: "O wie idyllisch die Straße."

[71] Friedr. Müller, *Werke,* I (1811), 270.

Ein ganzes Epos wollt' ich ja nicht geben:
Geburt und Hochzeit und noch gar den Tod.
Nur ein Idyll.—Aus eines Dichters Leben
Ein Nektarschälchen Jugendmorgenrot.[72]

Der Vergleich mit der romantischen Ironie drängt sich besonders bei Stieler auf. Auch hier wird der "Schein" zerstört ("Was ich erlebte? Nichts, nur . . ."), aber nur scheinbar. Auch hier ist es ein Auffahren aus einem Traum, ein Bewußt-werden, eine verstandesmäßige Deutung und Bezeichnung des Erlebten, aber nicht im Schmerze dessen, der über sein Erlebnis hinaus sieht, sondern im frohen Nachfühlen dessen, in dem sein Erleben noch nachzittert. Auch hier werden die Grenzen des Erlebnisses sichtbar, aber nicht um gesprengt, sondern um fester gezogen zu werden. Auch hier liegt Ironie, aber mit der (feinen) Spitze nach außen. Man ist daher versucht, den Schluß des *Winteridylls* als idyllische Ironie zu bezeichnen. Vielleicht darf man jedoch überhaupt das "Idyll im Idyll" als Ironie im weitesten, ästhetischen Sinne auffassen.

Stielers Werk weist jedoch nicht nur einzelne Fälle von "Idyll im Idyll" auf. Es selbst stellt ein "Idyll im Idyll" dar, und zwar ein vergangenes Lebensidyll in einem gegenwärtigen Winteridyll. Ähnlich liegt der Fall im *Wuz,* wenn man jene Einkleidung im Auge behält, wonach der Dichter die Lebensidylle Wuzens im engen Familienkreise erzählt, und in der *Idylle vom Bodensee.*

Wenn die Einbeziehung einer früheren Idylle oder eines früheren Idyllikers in die eigene naturgemäß erst den späteren Idyllikern vorbehalten war, so geht der in der Idylle so häufige Einschub von Gesängen, Geschichten usw. auf den Ahnherrn der Gattung, auf Theokrit zurück. Auf Theokrit weisen vor allem die Hirtengesänge bei Geßner, der auch den theokritischen Wettgesang kennt, die Gesänge bei Bronner, Ewald von Kleist und in den antiken Idyllen Maler Müllers ("Der Satyr Mopsus") und die Wechselgesänge zur Flöte bei Baggesen. Viel gesungen wird aber auch in den Idyllen Voßens, so in der *Luise* (darunter zwei Lieder von Voß selbst), im "Winterawend," in den "Goldhapers," im "Hagestolz" (Wechselgesang), in der "Heumad," in den "Erleichterten" (Chor), in der "Elbfahrt," in "Selmas Geburtstag" (Wechselgesang), im "Ständchen," im "Morgen," und in der "Kirschenpflückerin" (die Lieder werden wie in all den genannten und noch zu nennenden Fällen *in extenso* wiedergegeben) und in Maler Müllers *Adams erstes Erwachen, Schafschur* und *Nußkernen* (in allen dreien sind auch Erzählungen eingeschoben, im *Nußkernen* überdies Rätsellieder und eine musikalische Komödie). Besonders reich an Einschüben sind jedoch die epischen Idyllen Kosegartens und der *Poggfred.* Der *Poggfred* enthält außer den verschiedensten Geschichten Verse von Schiller (den ganzen "Pilgrim"), Goethe, Byron, Uhland, Lingg, Jensen, Mörike ("Denk es, o Seele!"), und eine Überbrettlszene.

[72] J. V. Widmann, *Bin, der Schwärmer,* 4. Aufl. (1913), S. 70.

Die Idylle hat keine bestimmte Redeform, doch zieht sie die Versform entschieden vor. Ihre Prosa ist oft künstlerisch fein durchgebildet und stellenweise auch rhythmisch gehoben (Geßner). Ihr beliebtestes Versmaß ist, dem starken antiken Einschlag und der Nachahmung der *Luise* entsprechend, der Hexameter. So sind in Hexametern die *Luise*, der "Siebzigste Geburtstag" (überhaupt alle Idyllen Voßens mit Ausnahme des "Bettlers"), *Hermann und Dorothea,* die *Parthenais, Jucunde, Die Inselfahrt, Hannchen und die Küchlein,* neun Stücke unter Hebels *Alemannischen Gedichten, De Vikari, De Herr Heiri* (Usteri), *De Herr Professer* (Corrodi), *Da Naz* (Misson), Caroline Pichlers *Idyllen,* Mörikes *Idylle vom Bodensee,* Hebbels *Mutter und Kind,* Eberts *Das Kloster,* Hartmanns *Adam und Eva,* Widmanns *An den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen,* Saars *Hermann und Dorothea,* drei Idyllen Platens ("Die Fischer auf Capri," "Amalfi," und "Das Fischermädchen in Burano"), fünf Idyllen Roquettes und der *Gesang vom Kindchen* Thomas Manns.

In Distichen sind Goethes "Alexis und Dora," "Der neue Pausias," und die "Römischen Elegien," "Hirte und Winzerin" von Platen, Mörikes "Häusliche Szene," fünf Idyllen Roquettes, Albert Moesers *Idyllen* und Pontens *Römisches Idyll.* In verschiedenen anderen Versmaßen sind die Idyllen Ewald von Kleists, die restlichen der *Alemannischen Gedichte,* die restlichen der *Idyllen und Eklogen* Platens, die "Lieder des Prinzen Vogelfrei" von Nietzsche, die *Idyllen* Münchhausens, Mörikes "Alter Turmhahn" (Knittelverse) und "Ländliche Kurzweil" (vierfüßige Trochäen), "Des alten Pfarrers Woche" der Droste (fünf- bis achtzeilige Strophen trochäischer und jambischer Verse), Kellers "Feueridylle", Heyses *Hochzeitsreise an den Walchensee* (Stanzen), C. F. Meyers *Huttens letzte Tage* (fünffüßige Jamben, stumpfer Reim), Stielers *Winteridyll* (fünffüßige Jamben), Kinkels *Tanagra* (fünffüßige Jamben, letzte Zeile der unregelmäßig langen Strophe zweihebig), Widmanns *Bin, der Schwärmer* (achtzeilige Strophen, fünffüßige Jamben, gekreuzte Reime) und Spittelers *Olympischer Frühling* (jambische Trimeter).

Prosaform haben endlich die Idyllen Geßners (mit Ausnahme des vierten und dreizehnten Stückes der *Neuen Idyllen*), die *Fischergedichte* Bronners, die Idyllen Maler Müllers, der *Wuz* Jean Pauls, die *Chronik der Sperlinggasse* Raabes, Seidels *Leberecht Hühnchen,* der *Gustav* Spittelers usw.

Eigentümlich ist manchen Idyllen, daß ihr Vers in der Dichtung selbst genannt und gelegentlich auch charakterisiert wird. Hieher gehören vor allem die *Parthenais,*[73] *Adam und Eva,*[74] Mörikes "Häusliche Szene" (Der Präzeptor und seine Frau wissen, daß sie in Distichen reden), *Die Hochzeitsreise an den Walchensee,*[75] *An den*

[73] *Parthenais,* II, 17 f.
[74] Hartmann, *Ges. W.,* II, 268.
[75] Heyse, *Ges. W.,* III/2, 152.

Menschen ein Wohlgefallen, Poggfred,[76] und der *Gesang vom Kindchen.*[77] Diese Erscheinung ist nicht etwa auf eine gesteigerte Bewußtheit zurückzuführen, sondern auf die in der Idylle herrschende Vertraulichkeit, aus der heraus, wie schon gelegentlich angedeutet, der Dichter sich gerne über die Schulter blicken läßt. Mit dieser Vertraulichkeit dem Leser gegenüber, zugleich jedoch auch mit der Vertraulichkeit gegenüber den angewendeten Kunstmitteln hängt die in der deutschen Idylle nicht selten zu beobachtende Anrede an den Vers oder die Strophe zusammen, die somit mit der schon behandelten Anrede an die Vorgänger, die Leser, die Personen der Dichtung usw. auf dieselbe Ebene zu stellen ist. Beispiele lassen sich aus Goethes "Römischen Elegien,"[78] der *Hochzeitsreise an den Walchensee,*[79] und dem *Römischen Idyll* anführen.[80]

Die stofflichen und formalen Fragen der nach-Geßnerschen Idylle, die wir hier erörtert haben, und ihr Gehalt, den wir an anderer Stelle behandelt haben,[81] würden wohl eine weitere Erhellung erfahren, wenn man die neueren Idyllen anderer Literaturen im Zusammenhang untersuchte, vor allem aber wenn man das Idyllische in anderen Künsten, der Musik, Baukunst, insbesondere aber der Malerei verglìche. Es würde sich wohl noch deutlicher zeigen, daß das idyllische Gefühl nicht auf bestimmte Zeiten, Orte und Menschen beschränkt ist, sondern daß selbst oder gerade in weltoffenen Epochen, "titanischen" und "dämonischen" Menschen der Drang zur stillen Enge lebendig sein kann.[82]

State Teachers College, New Paltz, New York

[76] Liliencron, *a.a.O.*, S. 6, 18, 39, 74, 166 usw.
[77] Th. Mann, *Herr und Hund. Gesang vom Kindchen* (1919), S. 143.
[78] *Goethes Werke*, hg. R. Petsch, I, 145.
[79] Heyse, *a.a.O.*, S. 152.
[80] J. Ponten, *a.a.O.*, S. 48.
[81] "Vom Wesen der deutschen Idylle," *GR*, XXII (1947), 202-17.
[82] Vergl. E. Kühnemann, *Goethe*, I (1930), S. 138.

CLEMENS BRENTANO'S NOVALIS EXPERIENCE

By Werner Vordtriede

In his book *Clemens Brentanos Liebesleben*[1] Lujo Brentano published, for the first time, the poem "Traum," the author of which was unknown to him. Written in a foreign handwriting, it lay among the letters which Clemens, at the age of 23, had written in the summer of 1802 to Hannchen Kraus, the girl whom he called his "new Arnim." Lujo Brentano came to the following conclusion:

> Den Dichter dieser Verse kenne ich nicht; sie scheinen mir auf einen sowohl Gritha, der Lilie aus Edelsteinen [Lujo still thought that Gritha Hundhausen, the go-between of the lovers, was the "new Arnim"], als auch Clemens, der Lazerte, nahestehenden Freund hinzuweisen. . . .[2]

The poem appears in this form:

Dem Wunder Haine wollt ich bang entfliehen,
Da funkelt es im Grase mir zu Füßen,
Als wollten Strahlen aus der Erde glühen,
Ich sehe Schimmer durch die Halme fließen
Und unter Veilchen, die verborgen blühen,
Von Demant einen Pfeil herüber schießen,
Schon will die Neugier meine Hand bewegen
Da leuchtet die Lazerte mir entgegen.

Und wie sie vor mir steht, durchdringt ein Beben
Die Nerven mir, ich möchte sie ergreifen,
Und wag es nicht, die Hand nur zu erheben,
Sie brennt so hell in wunderlichen Streichen, [*sic!*]
Wer mag in dem lebendigen Demant leben,
Welch Wesen hier zu höherm Dasein reifen?
Da flieht sie hin, erleuchtet meine Schritte
Und führet mich in dunkler Felsen Mitte.

Und in den Felsen ebnet sich ein Garten,
In dem wohl tausend bunte Blumen stehen,
Wer mag wohl hier der Blumen einsam warten,
Ich kann den Gärtner nirgends doch erspähen,
Und wie voll Sehnsucht meine Blicke harrten,
So süße Düfte durch den Garten wehen,
Und eine Lilie ganz von Edelsteinen,
Seh in der Blumen Mitte ich erscheinen.

Und kaum hat die Lazerte sie erblicket,
So kreist sie froh um sie in hellen Ringen,
Und kaum hat mir die Lilie zugenicket,
So fangen rings die Felsen an zu singen.
Wer je dich Demant Lilie liebend pflücket,

[1] Lujo Brentano, *Clemens Brentanos Liebesleben* (Frankfurt a.M., 1921).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

Der muß das harte Herz uns erst bezwingen,
Und wie sie so die bösen Worte sprechen,
Da wollte mir der Schmerz das Herz zerbrechen.

Der Schrecken hat den süßen Traum zerstöret,
Erwachend blick ich traurig auf und nieder,
O hätt' ich nie der Felsen Wort gehöret,
Wo finde ich den Wundergarten wieder?
Ein ewig Sehnen nun mein Herz verzehret,
Und künftig fragen alle meine Lieder,
Ists die Lazerte, ists die Demant Blume?
Die ich geliebt in jenem Heiligtume?[3]

Hans Jaeger recognized that this poem could have been written only by Clemens Brentano himself.[4] He noticed that in one of the letters Brentano compared the girl to a flower that blooms among rocks. Then, too, in Böhmer's posthumous papers there was found a manuscript of this poem, in Brentano's own hand, together with two others which form part of it.[5] With this, Clemens' authorship, even externally, was beyond question. Who could have been that third person who would have had to be an unusual poet at the same time?

But even if Böhmer's papers had not brought to light Clemens' own manuscript, it would have been obvious that the author had written these *ottava* under the direct and profound influence of Novalis' novel which had just appeared. The significant metaphor of a symbolical-allegorical dream landscape would have been impossible in German literature before Novalis. The artificial garden in *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* is the direct or indirect starting point for every poet of the nineteenth century who made use of this poetic metaphor. Brentano was, therefore, the first one to continue Novalis, and consequently, then, became an important link in the chain of all those who used the metaphor of the artificial garden to symbolize their poetic existences.

Each time Brentano flung himself into a new love affair he felt the need of urging the books which just then occupied his mind upon his beloved girl, since with him, as perhaps with no other poet, love and poetry conditioned each other. To his "new Arnim" he also sent the book which was then nearest to his heart, *Heinrich von Ofterdingen,* "ein Buch voll Unschuld, tiefer Weisheit, das man tausendmal lesen darf." Mathilde and Heinrich of the novel seem to him very similar to himself and his girl. He calls Novalis his friend and speaks of him as the "wahrhaft heiligen Verfasser."[6] He finds their relationship reflected in his friend's novel—Brentano did not want to be considered a poet, but rather a mediator (*Mittler*) of the poetic spirit. His concern

[3] Lujo Brentano, *op. cit.,* pp. 96-97.
[4] Hans Jaeger, *Clemens Brentanos Frühlyrik* (Frankfurt a.M., 1926), p. 33.
[5] *Ibid.,* pp. 215-16.
[6] Lujo Brentano, *op. cit.,* p. 38.

was not poetry itself, but the poetic existence.[7] In a letter to his new friend Achim von Arnim, from the end of the year 1802, where he thus portrays himself, he calls himself "nur ein Objekt der Poesie."[8] Each new experience of love puts this task of mediator before him. Not "dichten," but "gedichtet werden," later, by someone else, is his goal. Arnim might do it.[9] Paul Böckmann has made this tendency the basis of his penetrating study about Brentano:

> Brentanos Produktivität wirkt sich geradezu darin aus, daß er die ihm zukommenden Anregungen auf sein persönliches Lebensgefühl beziehen lernt und auch da noch von sich selbst aus spricht, wo die inhaltliche Nähe zu den Vorbildern am größten ist.[10]

The poem "Traum" is a striking example for Böckmann's observation. Here Brentano shapes his own experience in Novalis' spirit, giving at the same time an exegesis of his friend's poetic thoughts.

Just as the novel begins with a dream of Heinrich, so Brentano, in these poems, appears dreaming. And just as Heinrich, in his dream, enters into an opening in the rocks inside which he finds a flower, the Blue Flower, in the midst of many other flowers, so does Brentano. The face of a woman that appears in the blue flower becomes, in Brentano's poem, his beloved, and is identical with the flower. And just as Heinrich suddenly awakens, filled with yearning and foreboding, but far from the desired goal, so does the poet of "Traum."

Brentano's lily is made of inorganic matter, is a diamond with a stem and leaves "ganz von Edelsteinen." This motif appears twice in Novalis' book. It is used first in the "hermit's" tale, where he describes the interior of the mountains which often seems a *Zaubergarten,* in which the trees and flowers appear to be made entirely of precious stones.[11] Here, the artificial garden has not yet become a metaphor; it is a preliminary form of the artificial garden in Klingsohr's magic tale: the garden in front of the palace made of crystal, metal, and precious stones. It is the garden of Fabel, poetry, who finds it again after Eros, love, has shown her the way. The childhood of mankind, the original golden age, before reason and the Fates have crippled it, has its home in the metallic depth of the earth. When Fabel wants to destroy the Fates, she says "ich brauche Blumen, die in Feuer gewachsen sind."[12] The gardener, Turmalin, produces them artificially. But only through Eros will the frozen kingdom of Arcturus be awakened to life. Eros awakens Freya, "das Metall gerann und ward ein heller Spiegel."[13] Everything is filled with organic life. Even in the

---

[7] "Briefe aus dem Brentanokreis," mitgeilt von Ernst Beutler, *Freies deutsches Hochstift* (1934-35), p. 408.
[8] *Ibid.,* p. 409.
[9] *Idem.*
[10] Paul Böckmann, "Die romantische Poesie Brentanos und ihre Grundlagen bei Friedrich Schlegel und Tieck," *Freies deutsches Hochstift* (1934-35), p. 113.
[11] Novalis, *Gesammelte Werke,* ed. Carl Seelig (Zürich, 1945), I, 224.
[12] *Ibid.,* I, 291.
[13] *Ibid.,* I, 295.

artificial garden "a wonderful life" seems to penetrate the sparkling flowers and hot metallic stems. That, also, is the meaning of those words which are sung by the rocks in Brentano's poem:

> Wer je dich Demantlilie liebend pflücket,
> Der muß das harte Herz uns erst bezwingen.

Will he be able to bring about Eros' and Fabel's miracle: the animation of the rigid world through love? That is what Brentano asks at the end of the poem. The punctuation marks in the version given by Lujo Brentano are misleading. Clemens certainly does not ask whether he loved either the lizard or the lily, but whether he can find again the guide to the artificial garden and the flower which grows there; therefore:

> Ists die Lazerte? Ists die Demantblume,
> Die ich geliebt, in jenem Heiligtume?

It seems strange that Lujo Brentano could have thought that the lizard was meant to represent Clemens himself. Since Goethe's *Märchen* with its wise snake, such a knowing creature as a guide into the secret worlds is a firm romantic possession. The magnetic needle, in *Ofterdingen,* takes on the shape of a snake and guides Eros and Ginnistan:

> Die kleine Schlange blieb getreu:
> Sie wies nach Norden hin,
> Und beide folgten sorgenfrei
> Der schönen Führerin.

Poetically, if not zoölogically, the lizard is a snakelike creature. Besides, the lizard quite evidently belongs to the world of the artificial garden and not of him who is shut out from it. The animal, like its mistress the lily, has been transfixed into its inorganic shape; it has to mature into a higher existence ("zu höherm Dasein reifen"); in the end, when the inflexible rocks and the flower will change their appearances, it, too, will take on another, probably human, form. The lizard is not a disinterested guide; it lures the poet into the artificial realm, because only he can release it, whereby the animal, too, will profit. It is the salvation idea of folklore transposed from the heroic prince on to the poet.

In the letter to Hannchen Kraus, where he says that he had looked down into the marvelous valley where his "new Arnim" was blooming between the rocks, there appears also the Klingsohr motif of the redeeming mirror that accompanies the general awakening:

> Der neue Arnim spielt mit Edelsteinen; seine Umgebung ist ohne Spiegel und ohne Klang, und ich zittre vor der Idee, daß sie aus unschuldiger Sehnsucht sich selbst abgespiegelt zu sehn und die klanglose Stille zu unterbrechen, ihre Edelsteine irgend einem selbstgefälligen faden Scheingott der Jugend und Tugend hingebe.[14]

[14] Lujo Brentano, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

It is even possible that the *ottava* "Nicht lange wird der schöne Fremdling säumen" which appear in Klingsohr's tale have been the model for the meter and rhythm of Brentano's poem. In a later poem, "Heimweh,"[15] also in *ottava rima,* Brentano once more made use of this metaphor, incorporating it into his own personal mythology. It has become an important part of his own vision of life. The poem relates how, at the creation of the world, the kingdom of love was founded simultaneously with the creation of Man. Henceforth man is a stranger in the world, an errant pilgrim who has to find again the way to his primeval home, the kingdom of love:

Als hohe in sich selbst verwandte Mächte
In heilger Ordnung bildend sich gereiht,
Entzündete im wechselnden Geschlechte
Die Liebe lebende Beweglichkeit,
Und ward im Beten tief geheimer Nächte
Dem Menschen jene Fremde eingeweiht;
Ein stilles Heimweh ist mit dir geboren,
Hast du gleich früh den Wanderstab verloren.

(We may note, in passing, the curious similarity between the opening line of this poem and the one of the poem "Bénédiction" with which Baudelaire opens *Les Fleurs du Mal,* and in which he sums up the existence of the poet as *poète maudit*: "Lorsque, par un décret des puissances suprêmes.") The fourth stanza of the difficult poem would remain almost incomprehensible without this key which is given by Novalis and by Brentano's own poem "Traum":

Auch magst du leicht das Vaterland erringen,
Hast du der Felsen hartes Herz besiegt,
Der Marmor wird in süßem Schmerz erklingen,
Der tot und stumm in deinem Wege liegt,
Wenn deine Arme glühend ihn umschlingen,
Daß er sich deinem Bilde liebend schmiegt;
Dann führt dich gern zu jenen fremden Landen
Dein Gott, du selbst, aus ihm und dir erstanden.

The kingdom of poetry is, without any previous suggestion in the poem, supposed to be in the interior of the earth, among rocks. Instead of appearing as the diamond lily, the beloved here appears as a marble statue, a reminiscence, no doubt, of the marble image of the mother in his early novel *Godwi,* since for Brentano there is always an intimate interrelationship between the images of his beloved and that of his mother. The second line of the stanza is an almost direct echo of the earlier poem's "Der muß das harte Herz uns erst bezwingen." Once love has melted the rigid world and redeemed the marble image, then man, who here clearly stands for "poet," will easily be lead into the "distant country," the "Vaterland," which is the kingdom of love and

[15] Clemens Brentano, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Frankfurt a.M., 1852), II, 304-06.

of poetry. The God here is hardly the Christian God, but rather that *Göttliche* from which the poet stems.

These two poems, "Traum" and "Heimweh," allow Brentano's relationship to Novalis' *Ofterdingen* to appear in a very different light. It is well known how readily Brentano agreed with Arnim's devastating condemnation of the book.[16] He testifies to a "seltsamen physischen Ekel" which seized him upon reading it.[17] He wrote that phrase in October, 1802, only a few months after he had sent the book to Hannchen with highest praise and after he had transposed it into his own life and productivity. Since 1939, when *Das unsterbliche Leben* appeared, we possess the knowledge of still another passage where Brentano, under the first impression of *Ofterdingen,* judges it with praise. In the same letter in which he tells Savigny about his *Liebeshändel* at the Rhine, from the beginning of July, 1802, he also mentions the book which had just appeared:

> Haben Sie den Ofterdingen gelesen? er hat mich bis auf seine Anachronismen und einige Platitüden durchaus ergriffen.[18]

But between July and October, 1802, occurs his great and almost desperate wooing of Arnim's friendship. He offers to be his humblest servant with the complete neglect of every personal plan or leaning. It must have given him pleasure to sacrifice more than one judgment to that of his friend.

Brentano's relationship with Hannchen Kraus, at the time when he was estranged from his future wife, Sophie Mereau, and just after he had been rejected by Minna Reichenbach, is actually his Novalis experience transposed into life and real experience, in a process so typical of Brentano. The poem "Traum," therefore, is a testimony not only to Brentano's role as poetic "mediator" but also to the eminently autobiographical background of his lyric poetry.

More important than single parallelisms of theme between Novalis' book and Brentano's poems is the evidence about the power of Novalis' motif of the inorganic world which is the kingdom of the poet. The artificial garden has, in ever new variations, served the poets of the following century, now as a fundamental confession of poetic and existential beliefs, now as a metaphor for the oppressing sinfulness of their creation, now as a symbol of peril, and now as one of redemption. At the threshold of the century, in the very year in which *Ofterdingen* appeared, we have, in "Traum," the first creative continuation of this important vessel of poetic self-realization.

University of Wisconsin

[16] Reinhold Steig, *Achim von Arnim und Clemens Brentano* (1894), p. 41.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 51.
[18] *Das unsterbliche Leben (Unbekannte Briefe von Clemens Brentano)*, ed. W. Schellberg and F. Fuchs (Jena, 1939), p. 266.

ANCIENTS AND MODERNS IN THE EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

By Abraham C. Keller

The formulation of the idea of progress, as applied broadly to man and society, belongs to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But the prerequisites—stated by Bury[1] as belief in the independent value of mundane life, belief in the power of reason, and belief in the constancy of the laws of nature—had been established gradually over a long period of time. The idea of progress, especially as applied to knowledge, but not always so limited, appeared fairly clearly in many writers of the seventeenth century, including Francis Bacon, Tassoni, Galileo, and Descartes. In France it was variously advocated as early as the sixteenth century by such men as Rabelais, Leroy, and Bodin.[2] But from the early seventeenth century to the Quarrel of Ancients and Moderns in the 1680's and 1690's, the notion that modern men were in some respects superior to, or had certain advantages over, the men of antiquity was advanced principally by writers whose names are little known today—Rampalle, John Johnstone, Lancellotti, Hakewill, Glanvill, etc.[3] These writers who believed in progress constituted an intellectual "underground" which served to keep the progressive idea alive until the moment when society would find it acceptable. While it is true that the success of the "moderns" at the end of the seventeenth century depended upon important transformations in society itself, the role of earlier intellectuals in preparing their arguments must not be underestimated.

The names and works of many of these "progressive" writers of the seventeenth century are known, but the relationships among them have never been thoroughly investigated. The task would require a series of studies which would in themselves be relatively unrewarding but the sum total of which might provide valuable clues as to the quiet transmission of what was to become a fundamental concept of modern thought. The present remarks will attempt to establish several small points with regard to these writers, but it is hoped that further studies will eventually explain in some detail the perpetuation in the seventeenth century of the notions basic to the idea of progress.

[1] John B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (New York, 1920), Introduction.

[2] For early advocates of the idea of progress, see Edgar Zilsel, "Genesis of the Concept of Scientific Progress," *J.H.I.*, VI (1945), 325-49; H. Weisinger, "Ideas of History during the Renaissance," *ibid.*, VI, 415-35; and A. C. Keller, "Zilsel, the Artisans, and the Idea of Progress in the Renaissance," in the forthcoming number (Spring, 1950) of *J.H.I.*

[3] The principal exception is Pascal. But his remarkable "Préface d'un traité sur le vide," written about 1650, remained unknown until it was published in 1779 by L'Abbé Bossut, as "Sur l'autorité en matière de philosophie."

Given the dual fact that in France the idea of progress had made its appearance in well-known writers of the sixteenth century (especially Rabelais, Leroy, and Bodin), and that in the early seventeenth century leadership was distinctly in the hands of the English and Italians (Gilbert, Bacon, Tassoni, Galileo), it may be asked to what extent the writers of the "progressive underground" in France harked back to native sources, and to what extent they borrowed from abroad.

If we leave aside Descartes, who though certainly a "modern" never discussed the question of ancient or modern superiority in great detail, perhaps the first full-fledged advocate of the Baconian idea in seventeenth-century France was the Sieur de Rampalle, whose *L'Erreur Combattue* appeared in Paris in 1641.[4] The only discussion of Rampalle known to me is that of A. Henri Becker,[5] who, proceeding on the basis of certain similarities of phrasing, made Rampalle a follower of Louis Leroy.[6] This emphasis on Leroy's role in Rampalle's thinking is misleading, for two reasons: it disregards authors whom Rampalle mentions and with whom he has more in common philosophically than with Leroy, and it tends unduly to emphasize native sources in the revitalization of progressive ideas in France in the period around 1640.

Rampalle adopts a cyclical and compensatory view of the world, a view which Leroy abandoned in the famous last chapter of *De la vicissitude*. This is not to say that Rampalle did not know Leroy, but the indebtedness does not appear to be vital, so far as basic doctrine is concerned. Rampalle himself, in a marginal note, mentions two authors with whom he can more plausibly be linked than with Leroy. Rampalle's note, which Becker called "mystérieuses abréviations"[7] and which has not, to my knowledge, been clarified, reads as follows: "L'Abate Olivetano nel Hoggidi. Jonst. de Nat. Const."[8] Rampalle is undoubtedly referring to two contemporary works in the progress-degeneration quarrel: *L'Hoggidi overo il Mondo non peggiore ne più calamitoso del passato. del P. D. Secondo Lancellotti da Perugia Abate Olivetano* (Venetia, 1623; also 1627, 1630, 1637, and a second part, 1636); and *De Naturae Constantia,* by John Johnstone of Poland (Amsterdam, 1632). Lancellotti and Johnstone shared with Rampalle

[4] Full title: *L'Erreur Combattue, discours académique, où il est curieusement prouvé, que le Monde ne va point de mal en pis.* Histories of the idea of progress and of the Quarrel of Ancients and Moderns make no mention of Rampalle, although it appears to be he who introduced into French literature the progressive arguments current in other parts of Europe around 1640. Those arguments, advanced by such writers as Lancellotti, Hakewill, and Johnstone, are regarded by all commentators as important groundwork for Perrault and Fontenelle.

[5] *Louis Leroy* (Paris, 1896), pp. 272-75.

[6] Author of *De la vicissitude des choses en l'univers* (Paris, 1575).

[7] Becker says: "... outre que ces mystérieuses abréviations nous font entrer en défiance, les phrases copiées textuellement de Regius [i.e., Leroy] ne peuvent laisser aucun doute sur la source où Rampalle a puisé le meilleur de son argumentation, sinon l'idée même de son ouvrage." (*Op. cit.*, p. 273.)

[8] Preface to *L'Erreur Combattue.*

the view that history moves in cycles and the belief that what is lost by one part of the universe must be gained by another part. In particular arguments, too, Rampalle frequently follows Lancellotti and Johnstone (e.g., that men have always been the same with regard to stature, longevity, strength, cruelty, etc.).

But any attempt to link Rampalle to these foreign authors is confronted by Rampalle's statement (the veracity of which there is no reason to doubt) that he had no acquaintance with them. The paragraph of Rampalle's preface to which the Lancellotti and Johnstone references serve as a marginal note reads as follows:

> Ce n'est pas que ie me vante de m'estre advisé le premier de cet abus [i.e., that the world is degenerating], quelques Escrivains estrangers l'ont touché devant moy. Mais *outre que pour ne les pas rencontrer, i'ay pris une route tout à fait dissemblable à la leur* [italics mine]; Afin d'y proceder encore avecques plus d'ordre, et une oeconomie plus conforme au raisonnement, je passe du Singulier à l'Universel, et ne laisse que ce qui eût apporté de la confusion, ou de la superfluité dans mon dessein. Toutes choses y sont, ce me semble, en leur place, et peut estre que les Curieux y trouveront beaucoup de diversitez, qui sur un mesme sujet pourroient leur espargner de la peine.

How, without having read Johnstone and Lancellotti, was Rampalle able to say that his approach and organization differed from theirs?

One possible answer lies in George Hakewill's *An Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God in the Government of the World* (London, 1627; second edition, 1630), which bears an even closer resemblance to Rampalle's design than does either Lancellotti's or Johnstone's work. This book, a clear source for Johnstone's *De Naturae Constantia,*[9] may also have served Rampalle. This, if true, would account for the similarity between Rampalle and Johnstone without the former having read the latter. To what extent Rampalle may have borrowed directly from Hakewill, if indeed he read the *Apologie,* and to what extent the ideas set forth by Hakewill were "in the air" can hardly be determined. It may be noted, however, that if Rampalle read the *Apologie* in the 1630 edition he might have seen on the last page an advertisement of Lancellotti's *L'Hoggidi,* with this summary: "His whole discourse he branches into two main parts, *malum culpae,* and *malum poenae,* endeavouring to prove that the world in regard of either is not worse now than in former times." This is worthy of note because on the basis of such a summary Rampalle might well claim to have taken "une route tout à fait dissemblable," whereas a reading of *L'Hoggidi* itself would have disclosed a striking similarity with his own thought.

It is evident from a reading of the four books in question—Rampalle, Lancellotti, Johnstone, and Hakewill—that despite many differences they constitute a fairly unified body of argument in favor of the idea of progress. It seems certain that the ideas presented in these

[9] See Richard Foster Jones, *Ancients and Moderns* (St. Louis, 1936), p. 38.

books, particularly the notion of the constancy of the forces of nature, which was to be successfully exploited by Fontenelle and Perrault a half-century later, circulated freely in intellectual circles throughout Europe. Yet it is possible, in the case of the introduction, or revitalization, of progressive thought in France, to be more specific. In 1640-1641, when Rampalle was evidently preparing his book, Secondo Lancellotti, the author of *L'Hoggidi,* was in Paris. Not only was Lancellotti a vociferous enemy of the idea of degeneration and apostle of the idea of progress, but the purpose of his trip to France (he died in Paris on January 13, 1643) was the publication of two works which would bolster the arguments of *L'Hoggidi.*[10] Accepting Rampalle's statement that he was not familiar with Lancellotti, and giving it the broadest interpretation—that he knew neither the man nor his works—it nevertheless appears probable that he became acquainted with the Italian's ideas, for Lancellotti talked a great deal and was a successful and well-known author, so that Rampalle, interested in the same field and from the same point of view as Lancellotti's, could hardly have failed to be aware of Lancellotti's presence in Paris and of the line of argument which he was pursuing. This is assuming that prior to 1640 Rampalle knew nothing of Lancellotti or his ideas, an assumption which we must make for lack of evidence of a prior interest on Rampalle's part in the subject of degeneration and progress. It is even possible that Rampalle was moved to write his book by the currency of the discussion stimulated by Lancellotti's presence. However that may be—and leaving aside the strong possibility of Rampalle's acquaintance with Hakewill—the similarity of ideas between Lancellotti and Rampalle and the presence of Lancellotti in Paris at a crucial moment point to a predominantly foreign influence in reviving in France, through Rampalle, the arguments of the "progressives" of the sixteenth century, which had lain dormant for many years.

University of Washington

[10] That Lancellotti was a rabid conversationalist, especially about his own work, is clear from *Della Vita del Lancillotti Secondo Libri VII* (apparently an autobiography, MS C. 28, folios 1-79, in Biblioteca Augusta, Perugia, Italy). (See also Antonio Belloni, *Il Seicento* [Milano, 1929], p. 568.) The date of Lancellotti's arrival in Paris is uncertain (the most complete published sketch of Lancellotti's life, in Vermiglioli, *Biografia degli Scrittori perugini,* II [1829], 51-60, offers no definite information) but seems to have fallen in the period between the publication of *Chi l'indovina è savio* in Venice in 1640 and the publication of *L'Orvietano per gli Hoggidiani* in Paris in 1641. According to the MS *Vita* (fol. 67ᵛ), when he left Italy for France in 1635 (to try to find a publisher for his *L'Acus Nautica*), "risolve irne di non tornare mai più alla patria," but it is likely that he attended to the publication of *Chi l'indovina è savio* in Venice in 1640 before returning to France for good.

GAETANO POGGIALI, BIBLIOGRAFO E BIBLIOFILO

By Sir Henry McAnally

It is as well to begin by making it clear that in Italy two men bearing the name Poggiali achieved distinction: Cristoforo (1721-1811) and Gaetano (1753-1814). It has been said[1] that they were of the same family, but there is no record of their paths ever having crossed. Their spheres of activity were different; their lives were lived in different places: in Piacenza and Livorno respectively.

There would probably be little reason for emphasizing the separateness of these two if they had not been confused in the British Museum catalogue. There is an *Elogio*[2] by Jacopo della Cella (1741-1817). The catalogue says this short work (the date of which is given as 1803 and the place-date as "?Parma") is a eulogy of G. D. Poggiali. However, it contains no reference to Gaetano, and internal evidence makes it clear that it is Cristoforo who is eulogized; Tipaldo[3] says definitely that this is so, and the catalogue of the Bibliothéque Nationale (*s. v.* della Cella) takes the same view.

Cristoforo was a native of Faenza,[4] and his father's name was Virgilio. Of Gaetano a formal *elogio* would have been welcome as *elogi* are a useful source of biographical information, provided one relies on them mainly for facts. The long epitaphs which were almost a branch of literature are often minor (or sometimes major) *elogi*. We have one of these epitaphs[5] for Gaetano. Other than this there is available no concentrated account of this distinguished son of Livorno except a few pages in *Ricordi e biografie Livornesi.*[6]

Cristoforo seems to have possessed a collection "di valenti incisori, composta di piu di dieci mila stampe rappresentanti[7] gli uomini celebri in ogni genere"; Gaetano, as we shall see, had very pronouncedly a similar taste. Beyond this no similarity or connection between the two men is to be found. Cristoforo, it seems, would have wished to admit to his studies, which were profound,[8] "un amico ajutatore," but the person he wanted was "sott'altro cielo per inesorabil destino da

---

[1] *Nouvelle Biographie Générale* (Paris, MDCCCLXII); *Grand Dictionnaire Universel*, Larousse; *s.v.* Poggiali in both cases.

[2] This is entitled *Al Preclarissimo amico Giampaolo Maggi.* Maggi is not the object or subject of the eulogy; he is the recipient of della Cella's remarks.

[3] *Biografia degli Italiana illustri*, II, 96.

[4] Carlo Frati, *Dizionario bibliografico dei bibliotecari e bibliofili italiani* (Florence 1933), p. 468.

[5] Printed in *Giornale Enciclopedico di Firenze*, V, 382 (and elsewhere).

[6] Francesco Pera (Livorno, 1867), pp. 283-95 (quoted in following notes as Pera). The Labronica Library there possesses (carte Targioni-Tozzetti) many letters and documents relating to Gaetano Poggiali, for the most part unpublished.

[7] della Cella, *loc. cit.*

[8] *Ibid.* He wrote two very substantial books.

lui diviso." There is no reason for thinking that Gaetano was the person that inexorable destiny kept apart from Cristoforo,[9] and the distance between Piacenza and Livorno is perhaps hardly such as to have cut off the two from one another; to pass from Piacenza to Livorno would not have been, in otherwise than political sense, to pass "sott'altro cielo." Still their walks in life were outwardly somewhat different. This might have been a cause of separation, but Cristoforo, who became honorary royal librarian of S. A. R. at Piacenza, felt the spur of an "intimo desiderio di visitar archivi, di rintracciar documenti, di decifrare scritture e dispor materiali all'opera meditata."[10]

Gaetano not only lived his whole life at Livorno, but he was born there[11] in 1753.[12] His cinerary epitaph, already mentioned, which is the authority for his place of birth, also tells us that he was "genere apud Pistorienses nobili." This is perhaps a rather vague claim to nobility, but we may accept the region of Pistoia as the ultimate place of origin of the family or at all events of Gaetano's branch of it. Some accounts suggest[13] the possession by Gaetano of some inherited fortune.[14] He certainly spent widely and freely on books and apparently began doing so early in life. He is not known to have ever been "gainfully employed" in a subordinate capacity; the partnership with Masi (which will be described) may have become his life-work, because he was a great bibliographer by natural gifts rather than one who had achieved this standing by means of industrious application. So far as we know the main dates of his career, the former would appear the more probable.

Gaetano's son, Domenico, who provides a rather brief sketch of his father by way of foreword to the *Serie de' Testi,* says no more of his youth than that he "si dedicò dalla prima adolescenza allo studio della Letteratura, in ispecie Toscana" and that he pursued his devotion right up to the end of his days "con una passione sempre crescente, nè per verun accidente illanguidita giammái."[15] He first definitely comes before us when he edited his first Italian classic; to settle what this date is involves some assumptions. Domenico says his father repeatedly spoke to him of his literary career having extended beyond thirty years.[16] His father's death took place in 1814. If we take a time some few years before this date for the end of the thirty-year period, we

---

[9] Examination of the carte Targioni-Tozzetti confirms this.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Testi di Lingua* (Livorno, 1813), I, v. Full title of this book is: Serie de'Testi di Lingua stampati che si citano nel vocabolario degli Accademici Della Crusca posseduta da Gaetano Poggiali.

[12] Not in 1759, as stated by Carlo Frati, *op. cit.*, p. 468.

[13] *Grand Dictionnaire Universel,* Larousse, *s.v.*

[14] This is not incorrect. I have found out that Gaetano had inherited from his uncle in 1770 "una somma di denaro liquido e compartecipazione al reddito di una pizzicheria." Carte Targioni-Tozzetti, Fascicolo No. 76 (Asse Patrimoniale). I owe this fact to the Librarian of the Labronica.

[15] *Testi di Lingua,* I, vi.

[16] *Idem.*

might regard the literary career as having begun (say) about five years before 1780. Gaetano would then have been about twenty-two years of age and have entered on his inheritance not much before then.

How did he pass his immediately post-majority years? At some date he entered, and subsequently became a partner in, the Livorno publishing and printing firm of Tommaso Masi and company. In addition to his status as "socio" or partner, he seems also to have been, at a later date, literary director, very much as Bartolomeo Gamba, a somewhat similar figure in Italian life, was the literary director of the Remondini firm at Bassano.[17] It seems probable that Gaetano as his first step in practical life joined this Livorno firm. It was an important one, and Tommaso Masi was a figure of importance in Livorno. Gaetano's work in and with this firm became his life-work. His first step was his last.

In 1770 (when he was only 17 years of age) and in the decade following there was printed and published in Livorno what was the third edition of the *Encyclopédie Française*.[18] When it is recollected that a previous reissue of the early parts had been, at the instance of the clergy, seized and lodged in the Bastille and that an edition made at Lucca had led to the excommunication of all who had been engaged in it, obviously to reprint at Livorno was a bold enterprise.[19] The manifesto is dated "Livorno dalla Libreria Pubblica. 22. Feb. 1769." Alessandro Verri notes that "il Mastro del Sacro Palazzo avea esclamato che, se esciva guesta ristampa, l'avrebbe messa a fuoco." Guiseppe Aubert, whose enterprise it was, replied that he "non ha paura di fiamna nè di'fuoco, perche sta vicino al mare." In August the report was that "la sua [i.e., of Aubert] Enciclopedia sarà sicuramente proibita nei termini più forti." But by the end of November the Grand Duke Leopold II had accepted the dedication, was lending premises for the printing (Stamperia dell'Enciclopedia di Livorno), and had declared the work to be under his protection. Nothing more was heard of ecclesiastical opposition. Livorno had before this been receptive of liberal ideas. The story of Beccaria's great work *Delle Pene e dei delitti* is not unknown. His friends in Milan were afraid for what might follow any attempt to arrange publication there. The manuscript was consequently smuggled to Livorno, where the printing of it was undertaken by Giuseppe Aubert,[20] and the proofs were not sent back to Milan—that was too risky—but were passed for printing by him. Copies were in turn smuggled back to Milan and circulated without the authorities getting any inkling of what was going forward. Beccaria's book is as outstanding a landmark as any in the whole of Italian literature.

---

[17] *Enciclopedia Italiana, s.v.* Gamba, Bartolomeo.

[18] Pera, p. 29. See also the chapter "Stamperia dell'Enciclopedia" in Gido Chiappini, *L'Arte della stampa in Livorno* (Livorno, 1904), pp. 108-25.

[19] *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 11th edition, IX, 377.

[20] Pera, p. 26.

This highly interesting publishing episode took place in 1764 when Poggiali was only eleven years old. No doubt he soon became aware of it. What happened will go to show the character of the firm he was about to join. It had, we are told, "dato alla luce libri, che niuna altra stamperia in Italia avrebbe osato altretali."[21] The owner of it at the time of the Beccaria episode was Marco Coltellini, but the manager was Aubert.[22] As regards Coltellini himself,[23] we know of him as publishing presumably at his own press—the date of his establishing it is disputed—his drama *Venere Placata* in 1760. In 1764-1765 Algarotti's works (eight volumes) appeared with the Coltellini imprint; the later volumes locate the press "all'insegna della Verità." The next fact available is that he left his press on being selected to go to Vienna as successor to Metastasio in the role of Imperial court poet. This can be dated approximately to the latter part of 1769.[24] The date is important because it was then (i.e., about 1770) that Tommaso Masi, Coltellini's nephew,[25] succeeded him as head of the press; at about that time, or a little before, Giuseppe Aubert had left the Stamperia Coltellini for the Stamperia of the Enciclopedia.

Coltellini himself was not, so far as is known, associated with the production at Livorno of the *Encyclopédie Française* which occupied the years 1770-1779; that was Aubert's enterprise. He may, of course, have been a man of liberal ideas to whom production of the *Encyclopédie* in Livorno would have afforded gratification; he must have been a party to the clandestine handling of Beccaria's work. Still his own literary efforts were in quite a different direction—a direction more likely to be acceptable at Vienna. He was "autore dell'Alcmena e di altri drammi e liriche lodate dal Metastasio"[26] and had been put forward for the succession by the Livornese Raniero[27] di Calzabigi, himself, in one of his aspects, of Metastasian bent. It is on the whole perhaps not entirely a matter for surprise that Coltellini should have been ready to submit himself to the rigors of self-abasement which the court post called for, "per la quale," as it has been said, "anch'egli, come i suoi predecessori, avrà dovuto inchinarsi alle loro Maestà Serenissime, sia che nascano, o muoiano, o sposino, o vadano, o tornino, o facciano uno starnuto, uno sbadiglio, un sospiro."[28]

---

[21] Pera, p. 26.

[22] See letter of October 7, quoted in Cantù, *Beccaria e il Diritto Penale* (1862), p. 108; *Le Comte Pietro Verri (1728-1797): Ses idées son temps* (Paris, 1889), p. 94 n.: "Aubert, avec qui les rédacteurs du Café furent en rélations suivies, était le directeur de l'imprimerie Coltellini, à Livourne"; C. A. Vianello, *La Vita e l'opera di Cesare Beccaria* (Milano, 1938), p. 29: "Giuseppe Aubert, direttore della stamperia del'abate e poeta Marco Coltellini"; and *Carteggio di Pietro e di Alessandro Verri*, I, 336, reference to Stamperia Coltellini of which Aubert was director and abate Coltellini proprietor.

[23] He wrote the libretto of *La finta semplice*, Mozart's early opera.

[24] *Enciclopedia Italiana, s.v.* Calzabigi. But Chiappini says 1782.

[25] Fumagalli, *Lexicon Typographicum d'Italie*, p. 188.

[26] Pera, p. 5.

[27] *Enciclopedia Italiana, s.v.* Calzabigi.

[28] Pera, p. 5.

Tommaso Masi may of course have taken a part in the management of the press at Livorno (which was at some time granted by Leopold II the use of the premises which had housed the *Encyclopédie* press) before his uncle left for Vienna. But it will have been then that he entered into full control. What seems quite certain is that he was of a very different character from Coltellini. If there is any doubt whether the latter was of right or left tendency, there is no similar doubt in Masi's case. To establish the ethos of the man with whom Gaetano became associated on terms of intimacy we must anticipate a little; that is, we must at once take account of his actions when, a good deal later than the time of his succeeding Coltellini, the French descended into Tuscany. It is not necessary to go into this further than to establish what must from the first have been Tommaso's political bent. Fortunately his grandson, Ernesto Masi, has, in his essay "Il 1799 in Toscana,"[29] thrown light on Tommaso's political exploits.

Under Cosimo III, who had a reign of fifty-three years, the whole of Tuscany had been changed into "un vasto convento," but Pietro Leopoldo turned the tide in the direction of reform. Tommaso, at an early date, was allowing to be held in his shop "discorsi" by "mingherlini statisti," as a result of which he was warned and forbidden "tener seggiole e tavolino nella sua bottega acciò non si facciano tali indecenti crocchi."

The French occupied Livorno on March 24, 1799. On April 29 they constituted a new municipality and made Tommaso Masi its president.[30] To indicate his attitude we may quote a proclamation in which he speaks of the French as "calcando le luminose vie della gloria" and as exerting themselves "a rovesciare de' suoi cardini l'infausta mole del despotismo Europeo." Tommaso's rule lasted 100 days. Then the Austrians returned; and "a furor di popolo furono Tommaso Masi e suo figlio [Glauco] cacciati a pugni, e asputi in fortezza."[31] There Tommaso remained for some months. He was back again in Livorno after Marengo (June, 1800). It has been stated above that Coltellini was not concerned in the production of the *Encyclopédie*, but of Tommaso Masi his grandson Ernesto speaks as "uno degli editori della prima ristampa dell'Enciclopedia Francese." This, so far as it takes us, tends to show—what we should anyhow suspect—that as he was in 1799 so he was in 1770, when the *Enciclopedia* enterprise was started at Livorno.

Poggiali, however, seems not to have affected "dangerous thoughts" nor to have mixed dangerously in politics, and he apparently rode out the French occupation sufficiently uncommitted to escape any

[29] In *Nuovi Studi e retratti* (Bologna, 1894), II. In *Lettere di Carlo Goldoni* (1880), E. Masi speaks of his grandfather having served "onoratamente le lettere e la patria, come libraio, come editore e come cittadino."

[30] Chiappini, p. 78. He is there, with his son Glauco, described as "caldi ed appassionati sequaci della Rivoluzione Francese."

[31] Masi, *Nuovi Studi*, p. 242.

subsequent vengeance such as, in the whirligig of events, fell upon his friends Tommaso and Glauco. Demetrio Poggiali, in his short memorandum, speaks of his father as discharging "varie pubbliche cariche" and Gaetano himself, in his "avviso" at the beginning of the fourth volume of his Dante, speaks of himself as "distratto in altre occupazioni affatto aliene da queste," i.e., editorial work. He must have been something of a public figure in Livorno as possessor of his noted library if for nothing else. Livorno could then boast, and still boasts, one considerable work of art, the group of the Four Moors[32] (by Pietro Tacca, 1577-1640 and of date 1623 and 1625). We are told that "molti ragguardevoli personaggi, connazionali e stranieri, dopo avere osservato il gruppo dei quattro Mori . . . visitavano la biblioteca Poggiali e stringevan la mano al diligente bibliofilo."

We do not know how soon and by what stages this library, afterwards to become a national possession, grew up. What it became was "una sceltissima libreria, di pregio superiore alla fortuna d'un uomo privato, e degno piuttosto di qualumque gran principe" (Demetrio's account).[33] We hear of it as "fatta con spese e cure indicibili per mezzo di attive e numerose corrispondenze con letterati d'Italia, Francia, Inghilterra e Germania." The result, according to a contemporary, was "un'eletta squisita delle opere dei più eccellenti scrittori italiani o per il pregio dell'argomento, o per la rarità o nitore dell'edizioni, o per l'integrità conservata dopo lungo giro di secoli."[34] Accounts agree that the number of books amounted to twelve thousand, and it is stated that no non-Italian book was admitted.

The library, however, must not be thought of merely as a storehouse for Poggiali's precious books. It was also a literary rendezvous, a place where Poggiali delighted to welcome his friends and to hold learned converse with them. These were not merely professed bibliophiles and scholars like Bartolomeo Gamba, Michele Colombo, and the abate Moreni,[35] the last of whom speaks of Poggiali as "possessore di una vasta, ricca, ed insigne raccolta di rare edizioni si antiche, che moderne, e di preziosi manoscritti."[36]

When Poggiali refers to it and to conversations he has had there with friends, he speaks of it lovingly as "mea privata [or domestica]

---

[32] *Enciclopedia Italiana, s.v.* Livorno, where an illustration of the statue group is given.

[33] *Testi di Lingua,* I, vi.

[34] Pera, p. 286.

[35] Bartolomeo Gamba, b. Bassano del Grappa (Vicenza), 1776-1841. In the service of the Remondini firm at Bassano, then inspector general of the press at Milan, and censor at Milan and afterwards at Venice. Owned the Alvisopoli press; published there fine editions of the classics; administrator of the Marcian Library.

Michele Colombo, 1743-1838. ("nelle cose bibliografice fu una de' più valenti ch'io m'abbia conosciuti." Tipaldo, *Italiani Illustri,* VI, [1838].)

Domenico Moreni, 1763-1835. Author of *Bibliografia Storico-Ragionata della Toscana* (1805), 2 vols.

[36] *Bibliografia Storico,* I, v.

libreria." In the prefaces[37] to his editions (to which we are now coming) he several times uses such phrases. We have for the year 1810 a good account of Poggiali. About him Count Vidua remarks: "che sincerità, che franchezza, che facondia, che amore all'Italia, che buon cuore, che amenità." Elsewhere he speaks of passing, during a visit to Livorno, "ogni giorno tre o quattro ore con lui e co'suoi libri, e co' suoi manoscritti," and says that Poggiali has the "la più stupenda raccolta che forse abbia altro particolare in Italia, di libri rari, e tutti italiani. Non passai una gionata senza andare da lui, e quelle visite non erano tanto corte. Una di esse durò sei ore." He found Poggiali "il più gran galantuomo di questo mondo."[38]

We have seen what Poggiali's literary surroundings were in a material sense. To what use for the advancement of culture did he put the splendid equipment of books which he had provided for himself? What he created he built upon the Livorno tradition. In 1774-1775 we hear of Tommaso Masi, then recently come into control of his uncle's *stamperia,* issuing at Livorno an edition of an Italian classic—a collection in twelve volumes of tragedies, comedies, and dramas.[39] Such issues were to become, it seems, the stock publishing line of the business, and anyone now searching in libraries for Masi imprint books of the latter part of the eighteenth century will do well to keep eyes open for these fine editions—so they came to be regarded—of outstanding pieces of Italian literature.

Before what may be called the Masi-Poggiali period, we can trace at Livorno *first* the Coltellini-Aubert partnership and *second* the Masi-(without Poggiali) period. About the former information is scanty; there is not much more than we have already given. But as Poggiali is not then directly concerned, it need not be further considered. But of the latter, the Masi-(without Poggiali) books it would appear that Poggiali was not in all probability a part begetter. This is the inference to be drawn from the way he speaks of them; there is absence of any note of proprietorship, though this note is heard very strongly when we come to the productions of the third or Masi-Poggiali period.

There are several references to be found to the series of Italian classics which we may call the Masi classics. They are spoken of as being a predecessor series to those in the "Raccolta del Poggiali." They were fifty in number. Poggiali himself refers to them as the "raccolta de' poeti italiani in 50 volumes pubblicati alcuni anni fa in *Pescia.*" The Pescia provenance notwithstanding, these volumes all have the imprint "Londra Si vende in Livorno presso Giovanni Tommaso Masi."[40] On the face of these books there is nothing to

[37] *Novelle di Autori Fiorentine* (1795); *Novelle di de'Mori* (1794).

[38] *Lettere di Conte Carlo Vidua* (Torino, 1834), I, 163 and 155.

[39] *Storia Letteraria d'Italia,* Il Settecento, I, 579.

[40] The title of the firm was later simply "Tommaso Masi. . . ." Either Tommaso ceased use of the name "Giovanni" or another Masi of name "Tommaso" went out of the partnership.

show any connection with Poggiali; and, in fact, he seems inclined specifically to disassociate himself from them. The *Orlando Furioso* was one of these classics; it was also later one of the Masi-Poggiali books. In his description of the latter (1797) Poggiali specifically warns against confusing it "con quella [edizione] che alcuni anni fa prima fu pubblicata in Pescia colla data di Londra . . . poichè grande è la differenza che passa fra queste due edizioni."[41] Surely Poggiali, if he had had any share in producing the Masi editions, would have claimed it. He is not without praise for Masi books, e.g., he speaks of the Redi volume as "elegante e pregevole edizione."[42]

These Masi editions were in course of issue in the years 1778 (*Pastor Fido*, praised by Poggiali) to 1782 (*Tansillo* and *Poesie di diversi autori*). They are all dedicated, in rather byzantine terms (see especially the *Chiabrera*), to exalted personages: e.g., Queen of Denmark; Grand Duke of Moscow; Duke of Sermoneta; Lord George Clavering; Sir Horace Mann; the civil and military governor of the city, port, and jurisdiction of Livorno; the Rear Admiral of the Russian fleet in the Mediterranean. In the dedications stress is laid on the local associations of the selected "illustri Mecenati": "parzialità . . . per queste nostre contrade"; "graziosa permanenza fatta in queste felici contrade"; "i viaggi da voi fatti in queste nostre contrade."

The dedicatory notices tell us that the books were well received: "il compatimento, onde il pubblico riceve questa nostra collezione di poesie italiane" (1781); "nostra edizione ["series"] ha ormai meritato il compatimento e forse l'applauso della repubblica letteraria." There is independent confirmation of this. The *Gazetta Toscana* (December 4, 1779), referring to the appearance of three new volumes of the "celebre collezione poetica," says they are "dell'ultime perfezione, e invidian le più belle edizioni oltremontane." In 1782 the series is spoken of as still continuing, but there is no later volume than the *Tansillo*.

It was in 1792 that Poggiali began his famous "raccolta" in twenty-six volumes of *Novellieri Italiani*, but before this he had published under dates 1786 to 1788 two comprehensive editions: *Raccolta di poeti satirici italiani* (7 volumes, 1786-1788) and *Teatro italiano antico* (8 volumes, 1786-1789), and in 1789 the *Adone* of Marini. The first of these, and probably the other two also, was under the imprint "Londra. Si vende in Livorno, etc." as before; in these, as in the case of the fifty volumes, there is general mention only of "gli editori." But in the preface to the sixth volume of the *satirici* there is reference to a codex as existing "nella scelta libreria Poggiali"; this —1788 is the date of the volume—seems to be the first printed mention of the Poggiali library.

---

[41] *Testi di Lingua*, I, 35.
[42] *Ibid.*, I, 283.

The first of the twenty-six volumes[43] of the *Novelliero* is of date 1789, and the first four volumes are the *Decameron* of Boccaccio. In these the imprint continues to be "Londra. Si vende, etc." But in volumes 5-13 (the *Novelle* of Bandello) we have in the fifth and following volumes the imprint "Londra. Presso Riccardo Bancker." Who may this Bancker have been? I know of no explanation. It seems a bit of publishing mystification. Why then resort to this? An explanation offered is that "la data di Londra" was applied "forse per sottrarli al sequestro; che troppo spesso ridondano di scurrilità licenziose."[44] The object of the introduction of "Riccardo Bancker" seems to be to give some verisimilitude to what was otherwise "bald and unconvincing." There is no reference to Poggiali in any of the nine Bandello volumes, but when we come to the next two (*Il Pecorone di ser Giovanni Fiorentino*) the dedication is followed by "G. P. Salute." That was, we must suppose, as far as public disclosure could expediently be made of who was responsible for the book.

But of almost all the units of the *Novelliero* Poggiali caused to be printed special copies, not more than two usually, on *carta pecora* or *pergamena* or *carta turchina,* one of which was for his own library and the other or others he would give to a friend who is always named in the colophon; in this Poggiali's name was set out at length (esteso), and the name of the printer, Tommaso Masi, was also given. In a few non-special copies, instead of initials his name was given in full. The special copies, of course, were not for publication.

Poggiali was occupied until 1798 with the twenty-six volumes. At a later date he says that he had received from persons interested in the "toscana favella" many requests for publication of other novelle and speaks of an addition which he contemplates making to his series of twenty-six volumes. This never came about.

Livorno was an international port, and English trade had for a long time been firmly established there. The "English Cemetery"[45] of Livorno is well known; the records of burials in it cover a very long series of years. It is not, therefore, perhaps surprising to find Poggiali on terms of close friendship with several Englishmen. He speaks, for example, of the "ornatissimo Giogio Mathew, gentiluomo inglese . . . e suo sincero amico" who in another place is referred to as a "cul-

---

[43] The firm Tommaso Masi e compagni obtained the permission of the Grand Duke in November, 1787, to print the works of 31 specified novellieri italiani "con rami elegantemente incisi in Toscana." The actual 26 volumes included only a fraction of the approved list. Chiappini, pp. 93-94.

[44] Pera, p. 288. But in 1786 the Masi firm had sought permission to print, specifically "con la data di Londra" the *Teatro Italiano* and the *satirici italiani*: this was granted "tanto più che la Data di Londra disimpegna il Governo da tutto ciò che possa dirsi della Libertà con cui si esprimevano gli antichi . . ." (Chiappini, p. 88). The permission to print the *novelle* was given, and probably sought, as for a "con la Data di Londra" publication.

[45] Leghorn, *The Inscriptions in the Old British Cemetery of Leghorn,* with an Introduction by M. Carmichael (Leghorn, 1906); M. Carmichael, *In Tuscany,* 3rd ed. (London, 1907).

tissimo gentiluomo inglese." In another he dedicates a volume of his novelle to "Giovanni Newton" who, he says, repeatedly favored him with his "cara ed erudita conversatione nella sua domestica biblioteca."

Alfieri was at Livorno early in June, 1793, for four days "per. . . affari,"[46] and it seems hardly possible that he should not have met Poggiali then.[47] His business, in part at all events, was about an edition of the Tragedies projected by Tommaso Masi. Of this meeting with Masi, Alfieri has left, in a letter, a lively and possibly colored account.[48] What seems to have happened was this: Masi told Alfieri he wanted to "reprint him." Alfieri said: "Padrone" (i.e., all right; have it your own way). Masi then said he wanted to have an illustration—Alfieri's portrait, in fact. Alfieri made some objection but finished by telling Masi to do as he liked,[49] and so it was left. The programme or "manifesto" of the edition had already been seen by Alfieri's friend, Mario Bianchi, early in July. After the interview it was circulated freely (with date June 21).[50] It has been stated by Milanesi[51] and Bustico[52] that the book, of which the "frontespizio" date is 1793 was "procurata da Gaetano Poggiali," but Poggiali does not himself claim this, nor does his son.[53] Poggiali, however, states explicitly that the edition was "approvata ed applaudita dall'autore"; we may take this as indicating that Masi's opinion was that he had secured Alfieri's approval. As Poggiali seems to have "procurato" almost all the other Masi productions, it is now thought certain that he looked after this also, and it is very likely that he took part in the Alfieri-Masi interview. Masi *père* would certainly have very much liked to publish Alfieri; of his son Glauco (b. 1775) it is recorded that he "sapeva a memoria quesi tutto l'Alfieri, e ogni sua parola ricordava con venerazione parlando e scrivendo" and that Alfieri's works "era stato il cibo prediletto di tutta la sua vita."[54] The Masi home, and possibly the general Livorno atmosphere also, were, it would seem, Alfierophile.

[46] Mazzatinti, *Lettere edite e inedite di V. Alfieri* (1890), p. 263.

[47] Fascicolo No. 75 of the carte Targioni-Tozzetti consists of "lettere autografe di G. P. a diversi." I have not been able to establish whether or not any letter to or from Alfieri is in this fascicolo. But it seems probable (though this cannot be taken as certain) that Italian Alfierists have "rummaged and rerummaged" through it to find something relating to or concerned with Alfieri.

[48] Mazzatinti, p. 264.

[49] Raffaele Morghen did in fact make, for a reprint of the tragedies, an "inciso" of Alfieri, reproducing the Uffizi portrait. This was not considered one of Morghen's best efforts. Alfieri said of it: "il rame non è bello paragonandolo al dipinto." See *Iconografia Alfieriana,* Marino Ciravenga in *Dalla Casa del Poeta* (Asti: Maggio, 1939).

[50] *Annali Alfieriani,* II, 207.

[51] *Tragedie* (1855), p. lv; *Annali Alfieriani,* I, 206.

[52] *Bibliografia,* 3rd ed., p. 7.

[53] The Masi edition of Alfieri's tragedies was not carried beyond two volumes and was then "sospesa per convenienti riguardi." This is a little mysterious, and we could have wished that the carte Tozzetti would have cleared the matter up. Poggiali had two copies made "in *carta turchina,*" one of which (with the "manifesto" of the edition) is preserved. *Testi di Lingua,* II, 97.

[54] Pera, p. 358.

Another great contemporary with whom Poggiali had some personal connection was Goldoni (1707-1793). It was at Livorno that Goldoni made the acquaintance of Medebac whose company he joined and for whom he wrote some of his best plays. In 1789 Goldoni and Poggiali's firm were in correspondence.[55] The former had received the first three volumes—in 1792 he acknowledged[56] another four—of an edition of his theatrical works which the Masi firm was bringing out. Goldoni has high praise for the "nettezza" and "essatta correzione" of the impression. I have not come across this edition but it ran to thirty-one volumes in octavo. Demetrio Poggiali definitely says that this was one of the books for which his father was responsible, and he claims that in it the comedies were "emendate in molti luoghi con l'approvazione, anzi ad istanza dell'autore."[57] Goldoni in his letter of 1789 expresses satisfaction that Tuscany continued to be concerned for his reputation and adds that his compositions could only gain by being passed through the hands "dei maestri della lingua italiana." Poggiali was certainly such a "maestro"; Masi may have been.

Poggiali was evidently greatly interested in Machiavelli. He enumerates in his *Testi di Lingua* a dozen or more of Machiavelli's minor or other writings which he had issued with the imprint "nelle case dell'Editore." Most of these are editions of a single or two or three copies—artificially created rarities we may consider them. In several cases Poggiali himself speaks of them as "preziosi cimeli." Of some excessively limited editions he had given a copy or copies (outside what he had retained to grace his own library) to friends whom he describes as "di simili singolarità,"[58] i.e., with odd tastes similar to his own. These books Poggiali probably produced at his own expense and not as part of the firm's output; they were not on sale; Masi had no particular interest; and in them Poggiali is less careful to avoid offending the censors to whom Masi was, on account of his very liberal views, probably not *persona grata*. His edition of Machiavelli's works, the unpublished with the published, was, he assures us, received in learned circles very favorably;[59] it appeared in 1796-1797 in six volumes. He meets criticism apparently made of the smallness of the type used; it was the view of the "tipografo" that the whole should be kept within six volumes "per fare comodo ai culti viaggiatori [i.e., those passing through the port of Livorno] che amano l'edizioni poco voluminose, pel più facile trasporto." He indicates in a preface the source from which all the *unpublished* works had been drawn and advises the reading of it. The imprint, it is to be observed, is "Filadelfia." Machiavelli died in 1527; it was apparently still

[55] Pera, p. 358. Letter from Goldoni, May 15, 1789, Paris.
[56] *Lettere di Carlo Goldoni*, ed. Ernesto Masi (Bologna, 1880), letter of September 3, 1792.
[57] *Testi di Lingua,* I, vii.
[58] *Ibid.*, I, 204.
[59] *Ibid.*, I, 217.

difficult at the end of the eighteenth century to publish a straightforward (i.e., other than "alla macchia") edition of his works.

Of Poggiali's edition of Machiavelli no copy seems easily available for consultation. But it is otherwise with his edition of the *Divina Commedia.* He says in it that he regarded this as "forse come la maggiore, che io abbia mai sostenuta nella pubblicazione di molte altre opere tanto edite quanto inedite de' nostri più solenni Scrittori." He dedicates it to the "Regina Reggente d'Etruria." It was in four volumes, of which the first three are dated 1806-1807, but the fourth 1813. He had, as already stated, been "distratto in altre occupazioni aliene da queste." The book had cost him great effort and considerable expense. He hopes that as regards the text at all events his edition will be considered the best that has appeared since the great edition of the Accademia della Crusca (1595). He had founded his work on that edition but had also introduced readings from an ancient codex forming part of his own "ampia . . . raccolta di libri italiani così stampati che manoscritti." The claims of this manuscript have since been questioned. Typographically this edition is probably the finest of all he produced; he himself speaks of the "decoro, se non il lusso" with which it is executed; the type was Bodonian. It has for frontispiece a portrait of Dante engraved by Poggiali's much admired friend, the celebrated Raffaelle Morghen.

Poggiali's library, no doubt, like most libraries, normally increased by gradual additions. But in the year 1800 one of the chief of the famous old private libraries of Florence[60] became a prize for some collector to contend for. The Guadagni family (the remaining descendants of which have been called "tardi e dissipatori nipoti")[61] were dispersing their treasures. The details of the sale we do not know. It seems possible that Poggiali, being such a well-known bibliophile, was given a special opportunity of making an offer. It is not recorded how much in fact he did give, but the sum is likely to have been considerable. An authoritative writer says in regard to the matter "fu ventura che [i volumi] nè migrassero a biblioteche straniere come tanti altri, nè capitassero in mano di librai, che gli avrebbero dovuti forse rivendere spicciolatamente, scomponendone la compagine antica."[62] But Poggiali was the successful buyer. He has in several places claimed that he acquired all the codices of casa Guadagni and, in particular, that all the fourteen Dante texts which Piero del Nero had put at the disposal of the della Crusca for their edition of the *Divina Commedia* and which had passed by inheritance to the Guadagni had been acquired by him as part of his purchase. This is disputed, as are other matters connected with the subsequent sale of his total collection. But whether he acquired all the codices or not, the Poggiali

[60] *I Codici Palatini,* L. Gentile (Roma, 1889), p. xlvi.
[61] *Ibid.,* p. xiv.
[62] *Idem.*

collection is admitted to have become, on its ultimate passage to the Palatine, "la parte più bella dei manoscritti palatini."[63]

Poggiali has earlier been mentioned as a collector of "stampe." He was also interested in numismatics but of this only the fact is recorded. His collection of "stampe," however, we know to have been extensive; he speaks of his collection of the "incised works" of his celebrated countryman Bartolozzi as being "vast," but this was only a part of his "non vulgar raccolta di stampe de'migliori incisori antichi e moderni." Of the work of Raffaelle Morghen he had been a sedulous collector for about twenty years (this is in 1810).[64] He had been his attached friend and had wanted to write a life of him, but Morghen was too modest to coöperate. Poggiali possessed, thanks in part to his long and constant friendship with Morghen, all his earlier work except a few pieces. Where he found Morghen's work to approach perfection was specially "in ciò che al mecanismo s'appartiene." Poggiali mentions also the possibility of his cataloguing the "incisioni" of other artists—Balechou, Woollett, Wille[65]—and others of whose works he had made almost complete collections.[66] Morghen's incisions of Dante and Machiavelli were made at Poggiali's instance for his editions of those writers. The firm of Tommaso Masi e compagno seems to have employed several members of the Lapi family as "incisori" to illustrate books very much as the great publishing house of the Remondini of Bassano had in 1782 employed, we are told, fifteen *incisori in rame,* as well as various other ancillary craftsmen.[67]

Not very much is known about Gaetano Poggiali in his domestic relations. He is described as "giusto, morigerato, modesto, padre vigile in tempi difficili . . . affable con tutti, amico fedele, consorte amoroso."[68] His father's name was Demetrio, but nothing is known about him. His wife's name was Giustina, by whom he had four children.[69] In one instance his domestic affections definitely come through. One of the "nelle case dell'Editore" books (already referred to) was the *Storia di Tobia e sposizione della salve Regina.* He published this (1799) as a *Testo di Lingua* but also to teach his son Demetrio virtue. "Per voi, principalmente," he says, "figliuolo amatissimo, che siete il più caro ed insieme il più premuroso oggetto delle mie cure . . . mi sono risoluto di pubblicare . . . quest'antico volgarizzamento d'uno dei più divoti ed utili librii della Divina Scrittura."[70] He must, with his

---

[63] *I Codici Palatini,* p. xix.

[64] Poggiali's *Lettera di Filippo Baldinucci* (Livorno, 1802) is dedicated to Morghen and contains a great eulogy of him: "il Raffaelle nell'intaglio, come lo e il Grande Urbanate nella Pittura."

[65] Giovan-Giacomo Balechou, b. 1715 or 1720, d. 1764 or 1765. William Woollett, b. in Kent, 1735, died in London, 1785. Pietro Alessandro Wille, b. Paris, 1748. Son of Giovan Giogio Wille, b. Koenigsberg, 1717.

[66] *Atti Accademia Italiana* (1810), pp. 293-94.

[67] *Enciclopedia Italiana, s.v.* Remondini.

[68] Pera, p. 289.

[69] See letter in Pera, p. 345.

[70] *Storia di Tobia,* p. xix.

family, have come through hard physical trial. In 1804 Livorno was visited by plague. For the three months from September 21 panic dominated the city. It was not that the mortality was very large—the number attacked was a little over 3,000—but the alarm, not only in and around Livorno but in Tuscany generally and also in other Italian states, not only those adjoining, was acute; "si vide," we are told by a historian, "la misera Toscana separata dalla comunione degli altri popoli."[71] It is described as "febbre Gialla" and also as "vomito nero"; and "grandissima contradizione passava tra i medici" as to the cause. Poggiali and his family, of course, ran the risks, though the poorer quarters of the town were most affected. He lived on until 1814, and we are told that he was "rapito da morte immatura." He was buried in the Livorno church of S. S. Trinità.

After his death the then duke of Tuscany bought his library for 92,000 lire toscane, to unite it to the Palatine. At that time Dr. Francesco Tassi (Alfieri's last secretary) was the Palatine librarian, and he negotiated and arranged the sale. Unfortunately doubt has arisen as to whether Tassi was sufficiently businesslike and Domenico Poggiali sufficiently straightforward.[72] Important manuscripts which should have formed part of the transfer were later found to be wanting.

What gives unity to Poggiali's life and makes it an organic whole was the aim he steadfastly followed. If we are thinking of achievement on the grand scale, it is true that *natus moriensque fefellit.* Disinterring his career is consequently not very easy. His letters, of which the Biblioteca Labronica at Livorno possesses a considerable collection,[73] have not except in a very few cases been published. What is revealed in him is earnest effort to check "lo imbastardimento della lingua italiana" which tended to arise from "il forestierume" and "pella non curanza in che si tennero e i suoi scrittori e le sue grammatiche."[74] "Tanto lo arse" continues the *Giornale di Padova* "del gentile nostro idioma che difficilmente puo dirsi quanto egli per questo si adoperasse." The attempt has been made in this article to indicate what that effort was: his zealous search for the works of all the good writers and his editing of so large a range of them and his careful superintendence of the printing of their works. His son appeals in his name to the Accademia della Crusca as the "regina, conservatrice e maestra del bel parlare,"[75] and he himself appeals to the Reale Accademia Fiorentina as "maestra e norma del bel parlare Toscano."[76] These are the high authorities on excellence of speech of whose approval he was always striving to be worthy. This was his goal. One of his literary friends remarks of him: "ella consuma la sua vita nel giovare infinitamente

[71] Zobi, *Storia civile della Toscana,* III, 547.
[72] *I Codici Palatini,* p. xviii.
[73] Carte Targioni-Tozzetti.
[74] *Giornale di Padova* (1814), XXXIX, 176. Review of *Testi di Lingua.*
[75] *Testi di Lingua,* I, ii.
[76] *Novelle di Franco Sacchetti* (1795), Dedication.

alla nostra letteratura."[77] His standing amongst contemporary scholars and bibliophiles with whom he had many friendships was high. Domenico Moreni says he was "per comune sentimento . . . generalmente riputato, ed acclamato uno dei più rinomati bibliografi d'Italia."[78]

Cambridge, England

[77] Pera, p. 292. Luigi Clasio, Letter of June 14, 1813.
[78] *Op. cit.*

THE AESTHETIC IDEAS OF EMILIA PARDO BAZAN

By ROBERT E. OSBORNE

Emilia Pardo Bazán once wrote, "Todo el que lea mis ensayos críticos comprenderá que no soy idealista, ni realista, ni naturalista, sino ecléctica."[1] If one bears in mind that she is eclectic, and prides herself on so being, one will understand much that otherwise might seem contradictory. Some critics, in their zeal to pigeonhole every writer, have tried to force Doña Emilia into a "school" or into some particular pattern of writing or thinking. To do this, one must ignore certain aesthetic ideas which Doña Emilia professed and—in the main—carried out in her works.

The purpose of art, according to Doña Emilia, and the sole purpose, is to create beauty. She consistently denies that, in her novels, she is defending any particular moral system or that she is trying to teach any special political or social doctrine. Her task is only to create beauty.[2] Whether or not she carries out this principle in practice may be debatable, but, at least in theory, she never abandons it. Nowhere in her writings does Doña Emilia tell us what beauty is. The closest she comes to a definition is when she states, "—la fuente de toda belleza, que es la verdad."[3] The word *verdad* is, of course, vague in meaning, and she never interprets it. Pardo Bazán—who makes no claim to an ordered aesthetic system—rarely defines her terms in a precise manner.

When Doña Emilia speaks of beauty in art, she has no doubt been influenced by her studies on Padre Feijóo. She tells us that the finale of an opera where the tenor sings while dying may be beautiful but not true. A licentious, pagan work of art may be beautiful without being good. It is useless, she continues, to try to rest these conclusions on reason alone because in the perception of beauty there is a certain something, a *no sé qué* which defies logic and cannot be explained.[4]

Pardo Bazán maintains that beauty is, in a certain sense, eternal, but in another is subject to change, renewing and modifying itself as does the atmosphere. For this reason, when prophesying the triumph of realism, she states that she is not under the delusion that this is *the* form of art.[5] There is no definitive form for art, nor, in the strictest sense of the word, is there any progress in art.[6] The purpose

[1] Emilia Pardo Bazán, *Nuevo teatro crítico*, "Pedro Antonio de Alarcón- las novelas largas," Madrid, November, 1891.

[2] *Polémicas y estudios literarios*, in *Obras de Emilia Pardo Bazán* (Pueyo, Madrid, n.d.), Vol. 6, p. 139: "Por centésima vez, el objeto del arte no es defender ni ofender la moral, es realizar la belleza. Para defender la moral, salgan a la palestra los moralistas."

[3] *La literatura francesa moderna*, in *Obras*, Vol. 41, III, 224.

[4] *La cuestión palpitante* (Madrid, 1883), p. 146.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 187-88.

[6] *La Quimera*, in *Obras*, Vol. 29, p. 352.

of art is the creation of beauty, and man's conception of beauty may vary from age to age and from country to country. She believes that the writer who loses sight of art's purpose will suffer in the same proportion as he has sinned. Even if art should be based on truth, truth is not its principal function—that is the office of science.[7]

Art, says Doña Emilia, cannot be vulgarized. When one tries to place it within reach of the masses, one must put it on a lower plane. At some time in the past there may have existed a popular art, fruit of the social organization of that age, but be that as it may, modern art is not born of the people and indeed scarcely penetrates to them. The people are disinterested in both art and science. They are concerned only by those aspects which seem to be of immediate profit and advantage to them. Towards all else they show a stony indifference. Literary works are judged by how much they may be adapted to support particular political or social opinions or for their value as recreational reading, not by the beauty they may contain or even by what truth they may show. If it were not for that part of society which is perennially becoming aristocratic, and for the *moyenne illustrée* who can spare enough time from the daily search for bread to investigate art and to ponder over it, art would long since have been dead.[8]

Literature is gradually moving further from the people. This movement was greatly accelerated during the nineteenth century. It will lead, Doña Emilia fears, to a complete divorce between the artist and the people, and then to active opposition.[9] Pardo Bazán says that it looks as if the day will arrive when no one will read what the author is trying to say except the author himself.[10] Although considering art to be essentially aristocratic, she is, nevertheless, opposed to these tendencies to dehumanize art. "No puede el arte fundarse sino en la naturaleza, y en la humanidad, y son realidades ambas—inmensas realidades. Hasta la esfera, real también, de lo suprasensible, no la conoce el arte sino al través de la humanidad."[11] When art divorces itself from man and nature, it has no meaning for her, no raison d'être.

Doña Emilia believes, as has been pointed out, that not only is art essentially aristocratic, but that it should not be employed as propaganda. The only time she wavered in her opinion was shortly after the termination of the Spanish-American War. She could not comprehend the impassive attitude of Spanish letters in the face of this terrible blow. In this case, Pardo Bazán the patriot overcame the scruples of Pardo Bazán the artist.

According to Doña Emilia, the highest sign of human nobility is

---

[7] *La cuestión palpitante*, p. 130.

[8] *El lirismo en la poesía francesa*, in *Obras*, Vol. 43, pp. 376-77.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 83: "Desde Lamartine, la poesía, y en general la literatura, van paulatinamente desviándose del público, situándose aparte y fuera de él, hasta llegar a completo divorcio y, más tarde, a oposición."

[10] *La literatura francesa moderna*, I, 47.

[11] *Ibid.*, III, 24-25.

art, in which life, both external and internal, is reflected.[12] Since life is both organic and psychic, Doña Emilia considers that the spiritual effect produced upon her by a picture of the Virgin is just as real as the impression produced by the crude details of a factory. Art must not be mutilated but must be permitted to depict both the material and the spiritual—and by the spiritual she is not referring to that type of writer "—que escribe con agua bendita y a que Barbey llamaba *cretino*—." There are even times when she believes, with Gautier, that art is the only thing which endures. It is the sign of our greatness, of what we have been and the promise of what we may be. It is the archive for the activities of the human soul. *Ars longa, vita brevis est.* In many respects art is superior to science, for the art found in the caves of Santillana is as legitimate as that of the latest painter, whereas the science of yesterday may be useless and false today.

Doña Emilia never ceased to wonder over the fact that the artistic creation of man's fantasy could often be more important than the truth itself.[13] The suicide of Werther may be of more significance than that of some unfortunate who threw himself from a bridge last night. The Hamlet of Shakespeare is more important than any real Danish prince. What has just been said should not be interpreted to mean that Doña Emilia thought all works of art should or could live. On the contrary, most of art was doomed to die early if it said little to the generations which followed it. Therefore, she claims, what has been forgotten deserves, in general, to be forgotten.[14]

Art is amoral. That is to say, it is neither immoral nor moral. To be sure, says Doña Emilia, there are words which even the frankest writer does not put down on paper. Parenthetically, she once observed, "Lícito es callar, pero no fingir." Some limits are doubtlessly drawn by good taste. Nevertheless, one cannot condemn Shakespeare because he has passages in some of his works which might be considered immoral. There are, on the other hand, many highly edifying books which do not deserve the name of art. Pardo Bazán scorns that type of English novelist, so common in the nineteenth century, who deemed it his—or frequently her—duty to protect the innocence of the home. Such motives may be noble, but they are not the motives to inspire a true work of art.

Art must not be employed as a means of propaganda, for it is not utilitarian. It is, she says, egoistic, pagan, individual, and so only indirectly useful. It is a grave aesthetic error to place art as an instrument in the service of ethics.[15] She prefers the naturalist who ignores the subject of morals to a Hugo or a Eugène Sue who preaches on every page.

[12] *El lirismo en la poesía francesa*, p. 17.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[14] *La España Moderna*, "Dos cidianistas extranjeros," November, 1890, p. 80.
[15] *Nuevo teatro crítico*, "Una polémica entre Valera y Campoamor," February, 1891, Núm. 2, p. 47.

Art reflects the age in which it is born. This is a statement which is found in Doña Emilia's works from *La cuestión palpitante* to her last writings. No one can escape his times, and even the man who revolts against them is only the voice of many others who share the same dissatisfaction.[16] Literature undergoes a ceaseless transformation, adjusting and harmonizing itself with the times. She believes that if all history were lost it could be rather well reconstructed from the literary works of the past. Therefore, Doña Emilia thinks all periods in art are worthy of study.[17]

Since both science and religion do much to determine any age, they have always exerted an influence on art. The religion of a people has a direct bearing on that people's art, as even a superficial observer can tell. The influence of science has been particularly strong during the nineteenth century. Entire systems of art and aesthetics have been based on science. Balzac, Flaubert, Taine, and others proceed as much from the scientific direction as they do from the lyric impulse.[18] Art, thinks Doña Emilia, ought to make use of the sciences. The sculptor should know his anatomy well—but he must aspire to produce more than an anatomical model. That certain something, that *no sé qué* of which Feijóo spoke, must be present, and it is the exclusive patrimony of art. "Quien careciere de esa quisicosa, no pise los umbrales del templo de la belleza, porque será expulsado."[19] The domains of art and science can mutually support one another, but they must not be confused. The principal object of science is truth, while that of art is beauty.

Chronology is deceptive and must always be weighed when speaking of an age. Dumas, Hugo, Vigny, Sainte-Beuve, Gautier, and Stendhal—different from one another in many respects—were all writing in the same period. Pardo Bazán thinks that no period ever possessed complete unity. In former times, powerful general currents may have caused such an illusion, but this unity in reality did not exist. The apparent unity of the eighteenth century, for example, disappears when one remembers that Voltaire doubtlessly thought Rousseau was a fool.

Doña Emilia distrusts schools of writing. She is too eclectic to be tied to any one formula. There is a great difference, she notes, between general principles of aesthetics and the schools which aspire to embody them. Usually the schools are limitations of the principles.[20] No author ought to be scandalized at a new type of writing, for each literary movement is born of the preceding one, and they are linked together with an almost mathematical precision. The caprice of any

---

[16] *El lirismo en la poesía francesa*, p. 11.
[17] *Los poetas épicos cristianos*, Administración (Madrid, 1895), p. 97.
[18] *La literatura francesa moderna*, I, 294-95.
[19] *La cuestión palpitante*, p. 19.
[20] *El lirismo en la poesía francesa*, p. 26.

particular writer is not enough in itself to bring about new artistic forms.

Doña Emilia shows considerable distrust for literary theories. If Shakespeare were to formulate his theory of art, she believes it would not be too different from that of Victor Hugo, and yet how dissimilar the results when put into practice. The theater of Shakespeare is immortal and that of Hugo is alive only as a curiosity, as a document.

Although Doña Emilia believes that no one man can bring about a literary movement, she lays much stress on the importance of the individual in literature. However, she does lament the loss of many of the great collective ideals of the past and deplores the present tendency to make the individual sacred, not because of any value he may have, but merely because he is an individual. As art will always be the exception, she thinks these trends bode ill for its future.[21] Nevertheless, resistance to that which limits and restrains the individual has always been of much import to aesthetics and literature in all ages. Whatever the dogmas of any given school, the individual is always above them. What the naturalists called the *tempérament* is of paramount importance to her. She is opposed to such anti-individualistic views as those held by Taine. Take away Napoleon, and you will change the history of Europe. As to why a group of exceptionally gifted artists should happen to live in the same time and place, thus producing a golden age—as in the case of painters in seventeenth-century Holland—she says she has no explanation. Taine, with his race, environment, and time theory, does not convince her (although she has often used this idea), since opposing conclusions could be drawn from this hypothesis. The only thing that can be said is that it happened. No one explanation is completely satisfactory.

As Pardo Bazán opines that one cannot re-create the past, not so much because of lack of skill or data, but because we do not have the spirit of former times, she places much stress, in literature, on the development of characters. There are, broadly speaking, two types of characters. Tartuffe represents one kind. He is a universal character and stands for or symbolizes something, in this case the hypocrite. Richard III is an individual character. He is an ambitious king, but we see in him things we do not observe in other monarchs, other ambitious leaders, and other men of his time.[22] She prefers the latter type. The individual character is more suited to show that conflict in the human soul which is for her all-important. That conflict, she says,

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 240: "El individuo es sagrado, no por valer, sino sencilla y meramente por su condición de individuo, inconfundible con la colectividad. Y claro es que esta suposición es la más incompatible con los derechos del arte: porque el arte será siempre una excepción, y, por tanto, una especialización individual. Así, a medida que los principios del individualismo político y social van avanzando y ganando terreno, el arte pierde su eficacia sobre las colectividades, y pasa a ser patrimonio y bien y pan espiritual solamente de unos pocos, cada vez más distanciados del público."

[22] *La literatura francesa moderna*, III, 137.

can be summarized under the two headings of sin and repentance.[23] The man who does evil and who does not feel that he is so doing is of little interest to others. Therefore, when the naturalists took away responsibility from the individual, they committed a serious blunder. Here again, one is compelled to note that Doña Emilia did not always carry out in her creative writings what she preached in theory, and some critics, such as Ortega y Gasset, have said harsh words about her methods of characterizing. But here we are concerned chiefly with her theory.

The question of style was one which often perplexed Doña Emilia. Sometimes a very polished and correct style may place a veil between the reader and the work—perhaps a golden veil, but nevertheless a veil. If the other extreme is taken, the author permits his style to become too relaxed, and he will offend the reader of taste. The style of the work will degenerate into journalism. She herself thinks that when a character speaks for himself, the author should respect the form in which the character would naturally talk and think, but when the author is speaking, then he may show himself in a language which is elegant and if possible perfect. It is on these grounds that she criticizes Valera's characters, saying, "En Valera no hay Sanchos, todos son Valeras."[24] She claims that it is not her intention to mutilate the form of the language under any circumstances, but new words and expressions from everyday speech can be introduced into the literary language whenever they are suitable.[25] Here she has been both impressed and influenced by Hugo's remarks on the subject, remarks which she often quotes.

The literature of the first years of the twentieth century excited considerable comment from Doña Emilia. What is modern in art, she believes, is not the describing of a factory or the cursing of an emperor, but a manner of feeling with that peculiarly modern *sensibilidad.*[26] Here again, Doña Emilia is not so precise in her definition of terms as we might wish. The *Salomé* of Oscar Wilde is very modern, even though the incidents take place almost two thousand years ago in the Near East. Literature, she feels, is not moving toward the simple, but toward the complicated and the *conceptuoso.* With the first World War, she sees the closing of a literary age which began with romanticism and ended with the "disgregación escolástica absoluta" in the first years of the twentieth century. The present moment, said Doña Emilia, is different from others which we know in history, not only because it is materialistic, but because it is so anti-lyrical, so

[23] *Ibid.,* III, 204: "Todos los conflictos del alma humana se resumen en el pecado y el arrepentimiento."

[24] *La cuestión palpitante,* p. 172.

[25] *De mi tierra,* "Feijóo y su siglo," in *Obras,* Vol. 9, pp. 199-200. (This is only one example chosen at random. Many others could be cited.)

[26] *La literatura francesa moderna,* III, 273.

utilitarian.[27] These differences will, of course, be reflected in art.

She is, on the whole, pessimistic about the future of literature. She believes there is a decadence in Spain, noting only a few exceptions such as Maeztu, Baroja, and "Azorín." The same decadence she perceives elsewhere, as in the English novel. She is not certain there will be a renaissance. Perhaps, she told Pagano, the world was growing tired. The conception of the ideal is decaying more and more. There have been Titans, Gods, and Heroes. "Hoy es el Superhombre, mañana será el Hombre."[28]

University of Connecticut

---

[27] *El lirismo en la poesía francesa*, p. 24.

[28] J. L. Pagano, *Al través de la España literaria* (Barcelona, 1904), "Emilia Pardo Bazán," II, 123.

REVIEWS

A Commentary on the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales. By MURIEL BOWDEN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. Pp. xii + 316. $4.00.

No student of Chaucer can fail to find something of interest and value in Miss Bowden's book on the General Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales.* For the author has summarized, with extensive quotations, the bulk of the historical material which American, British, and, to some extent, Continental scholars have uncovered in the past fifty-odd years about the Canterbury pilgrims. The material is bound to be useful, even if it merely obviates the need, when one wishes to recall forgotten or half-remembered facts, for extensive reading in many scattered periodicals and books. Although any scholar or student will, of course, still have to go to the sources if he plans to do any serious work on the General Prologue, the book is none the less useful for a quick survey of available background material.

A Commentary consists of nineteen chapters, the first of which presents a rather inadequate picture of Chaucer's England in the years 1380-1387 as general background and the remainder of which are devoted to a presentation of the characters ending with the Host. The figures which have attracted most study are usually given a full chapter each, while the others are combined in various ways. The order, however, follows that of Chaucer.

The book, as the Preface informs us, was written for Chaucerian scholars, college students studying Chaucer, and general readers. This wide range leads to some confusion and dissatisfaction which are only partially allayed by the author's acknowledgment of her difficulties. It is hard to conceive of a general reader, college student, or even some scholars making much out of the difficult Latin passage quoted on page 258 which gives an inscription found on a tally of 1388. It is also hard to understand certain inconsistencies in Miss Bowden's procedure. *Piers Plowman,* for instance, which is heavily drawn upon to give us social background material, is usually quoted in the original, and yet on page 210 we come upon a passage from that poem reworked into modern English. Scholars may also find some difficulty in following the author's method of bibliographical reference.

Miss Bowden might have removed some possible criticism of her work by including the term historical in her title. One feels, moreover, that a stronger sense for the poetry of the Prologue would have helped her in her professed aim, for Chaucer is an artist before he is a social historian, and it is reasonable to assume that his artistic aims influenced his picture of social life. For instance, an awareness of the irony of the line:

> She koude muchel of wandrynge by the weye (line 467)

makes its primary meaning even more significant than a literal reading can do. The Wife of Bath knew a great deal about the pilgrim routes, but perhaps even more about the primrose path.

Even on the historical and social level, however, Miss Bowden uncritically accepts certain assumptions which are strange. The author, for instance, seems to believe that if a character is individual rather than typical, it is most likely that Chaucer had a real person in mind. I know that the issue raises the whole

problem of the value of hunting for models and of what is an individual and what is a type. It is perhaps too much to ask that Miss Bowden go into this whole problem—into the validity of the familiar dichotomy between individual and type and its relationship to the kind of art the artist is practicing (we cannot ask the same kind of characterization from, say, the author of *Everyman* as from the author of *Gawain and the Green Knight*). But we might expect her to be careful in making certain generalizations about the real person behind the character.

Not only does Miss Bowden accept basic aesthetic and philosophical assumptions which are at least questionable, but she also accepts certain clichés about Chaucer and the fourteenth century, the value of which lies chiefly in their ubiquity and longevity. Chaucer, we are told, was "in no sense a reformer" (p. 69). It seems to me that in Chaucer's work we have a profound criticism of life. The man who gave us portraits of the parish priest, the summoner, and the pardoner, not a reformer? If the author means that Chaucer did not get out on street corners and arouse the mob, she is no doubt right. In any other sense, I do not know what can be meant by the phrase. We are also told that the medieval world was "extraordinarily complicated and hazardous" (p. 22). Is the medieval world any more complicated than the Renaissance or for that matter the contemporary world?

Miss Bowden also makes some rather dangerous leaps in logic. We are referred to Deschamps' ballade to the "grant translateur, noble Geffroy Chaucier" (pp. 12-13) as the only proof that "Chaucer's genius had now received generous recognition in France." Even a closer look at the title of the ballade might make us suspicious of the truth of this conclusion. On page 283, Miss Bowden on the basis of a very dubious parallel suggests that Chaucer may possibly have borrowed his picture of the Pardoner from Boccaccio's *Decameron*. After some contemporary quotations about dishonest reeves, we are told on pages 251-52 that in this respect Chaucer's Reeve was typical. I think we might assume that some medieval reeves were dishonest and some were honest and that moralists would inveigh against dishonest reeves—and that none of these facts has any bearing on the typicality of the Reeve.

There are other logical solecisms and other examples of the uncritical acceptance of hallowed beliefs about Chaucer as well as a number of naïve statements, such as that love played a large part in Chaucer's youthful consciousness (p. 75), but it is needless and ungrateful to list them. A little more care would have made this commentary fulfill its purpose. In any case, Miss Bowden's book will make it easier for some future critic to give us the ideal commentary on the General Prologue in which poetic and historical elements will be given their proper weight.

Morton W. Bloomfield

Ohio State University

The Renaissance Philosophy of Man. Edited by Ernst Cassirer, Paul Oskar Kristeller, and John Herman Randall, jr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 405. $5.00.

As the study of Renaissance literature in relation to Renaissance thought becomes more prevalent, the demand for accurate editions of significant texts has increased. Students of Renaissance literature will therefore welcome the appearance of *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man,* edited by the late Ernst

Cassirer, and Professors Paul Oskar Kristeller and John Herman Randall, Jr., of the Department of Philosophy of Columbia University. The work contains an introduction describing the main trends and problems of the earlier Italian Renaissance philosophy and selections from the works of Petrarch, Valla, Pico, Pomponazzi, and Vives (the latter as an appendix), with introductions, translations, and notes on the texts by a group of scholars trained at Columbia.

Though necessarily limited by the editors to the philosophy of the earlier Italian Renaissance, the anthology serves as a dependable guide through the complexities of Renaissance thought as a whole. In their introduction, Professors Kristeller and Randall, who have already done much to clarify the maze of Renaissance philosophy and science, rehabilitate the reputation of Renaissance philosophy which has fallen between the heights of thirteenth-century Thomism and seventeenth-century science. They suggest that the three main philosophical trends of the earlier Italian Renaissance are Humanism, Platonism, and Aristotelianism, which, though stemming from differing ideological traditions, nevertheless are centered on the same problems, those of the idea of immortality, the defense of personal values, and the nature of man and of human dignity.

The translations from Petrarch, by Hans Nachod, comprise six letters, including the one describing the ascent of Mont Ventoux, and the book *On His Own Ignorance*. These documents once more bring into question the characterization of Petrarch as the first of the moderns, for if the portrait of a unique personality does indeed emerge, it is also true that Petrarch's mind is drenched in medieval ways of thought: the ascent is as much an allegory of the ascent of the soul as it is the story of a mountain climb, if not more so. Here then is one paradox of Renaissance thought; another is provided by Charles Trinkhaus' introduction to and translation of Valla's *Dialogue on Free Will* which show that Valla, though a student of classical rhetoric and philology and ostensibly an orthodox Catholic, in point of fact breaks with "rationalistic medieval and Renaissance Catholicism" on much the same grounds which the reformers were later to take.

The syncretic impulse so characteristic of Renaissance thought is well illustrated by the translation of Ficino's *Five Questions Concerning the Mind* by Josephine Burroughs and by Pico's *Oration on the Dignity of Man*, translated by Elizabeth Forbes, in which an almost incompatible variety of sources is employed. But in defense of the use of this almost indiscriminate mélange of materials, it must be pointed out that, first, the Renaissance was confronted with a much greater amount and variety of sources, themes, and ideas than the classical and medieval worlds possessed, and second, that it did attempt to synthesize this mass of materials into a unified and humane system, of which Pico's *Oration* is a noble example.

Still another crosscurrent of Renaissance thought is shown by Professor Randall's excellent introduction and revision of William Hay's translation of Pomponazzi's *On the Immortality of the Soul* in which scientific Padua is found responding to the influence of Florentine Platonism and is thereby stimulated to humanize Aristotle. Finally, Vives' *Fable About Man*, translated by Nancy Lenkeith, brings together classical, Christian, and contemporary sources to create a truly Renaissance philosophy of the dignity of man.

Thus, while the anthology does not undertake to show the intellectual unity of Renaissance thought, it more significantly illustrates the variety and range of that thought. Indeed, it is quite possible that a synthesis of Renaissance thought may ultimately prove impossible, at least by the method of characterization by

schools of thought, for the reason that variety and range are in fact its most distinctive and important features. In any event, students of Renaissance literature will find here the sources of many ideas and points of view later expressed by writers of literature proper; this is particularly true of the Neo-Platonist texts. As a source of influential documents as well as a guide, by way of the illuminating introductions and careful notes, to the many aspects of Renaissance thought, *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man* is a welcome tool for the use of the student of Renaissance literature.

Herbert Weisinger

Michigan State College

A History of Hamlet Criticism, 1601-1821. By Paul S. Conklin. New York: King's Crown Press, 1947. Pp. viii + 176. $2.75.

In this book Professor Conklin, by presenting the history of *Hamlet* criticism in relation to the "climate of opinion" of the various periods covered, has produced a useful and illuminating work.

The seventeenth-century record, which relates primarily to the stage history from Burbage to Betterton, shows only slight beginnings of formal literary criticism, but the author demonstrates from contemporary opinion that Hamlet was from the beginning perceived by spectators both as an avenger and a malcontent, and as an active, heroic character.

In the section on the eighteenth century the histrionic tradition and the development of formal criticism are traced separately. The former, beginning with Betterton's later years and extending through Garrick's career, is shown to carry on, in the main, the conception of the active and heroic prince, although in Garrick's case there was a refinement and subtlety absent in the earlier, more robust interpretations. The formal literary criticism of the eighteenth century falls into two periods: 1700-1770 and 1770-1800. The first of these was dominated by neo-classical literary canons, and the critics, uninformed concerning Elizabethan dramatic history, were unduly concerned about features of Hamlet's character—his "cruelty," for example—unsympathetic to eighteenth-century ideals. *Some Remarks on the Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark* (1736), perhaps by Thomas Hanmer, offered an exception to the prevailing doctrinaire criticism, approximating in some ways the methods and conclusions of modern historical scholars, while still reflecting current attitudes. After 1770, new features in the interpretation of Hamlet's character emerged, including "a development of the procrastination motif," "a development of the madness motif," and "a development of the romantic tendency to read into Hamlet's character some prominent element in the psychology of the critic, the prince thus becoming a 'man-of-feeling,' a 'young Werther,' or the like." Professor Conklin selects William Richardson's *Philosophical Analysis of Some of Shakespeare's Remarkable Characters* (1774) as "the first unequivocal contribution to critical interpretation of the 'new Hamlet.'" The eighteenth century saw, too, the beginnings of a sound historical criticism—initiated by Edmund Malone—and the establishment of the international reputation of the play. No sound interpretations were produced on the continent, however. Voltaire was too completely circumscribed by the neo-classical rules to see in Shakespeare anything more than a barbarian of genius; Goethe only aided the romantic aberration from the authentic tradition.

The last section of the book deals with the first two decades of the nineteenth century, which, in spite of the partially satisfactory productions of the Kembles and Edmund Kean, showed a decline in the quality of stage presentations of *Hamlet*. Partly for this reason the formal criticism of the play became almost completely divorced from the histrionic tradition. The tendency to "psychologize," begun in the later eighteenth century, was continued, and Hamlet was even more completely "romanticized." Coleridge, seeing in his character an excess of "subjectivity" over "objectivity," produced the most influential of all *Hamlet* criticism, but his brilliant passages induced by the reading of the play cannot be said to produce a reliable guide to authentic interpretation.

In this book Professor Conklin has produced an able work which provides valuable support for the modern historical critics who have done much to restore the *Hamlet* of Shakespeare and his contemporaries.

Claude M. Newlin

Michigan State College

Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery. Volume II, *A Bibliography of Emblem Books.* By Mario Praz. London: The Warburg Institute, University of London, 1947. Pp. xi + 209. £2.10.0.

The Warburg Institute published Mario Praz's fascinating and scholarly *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery,* Volume I, in 1939, thereby inaugurating a new period in the study and understanding of the seventeenth-century intellectual climate and, in particular, of its poetry. Now the long-awaited and equally important second volume, *A Bibliography of Emblem Books,* is available.

In a modest preface Professor Praz says, "While I am aware of the shortcomings of this bibliography (or, rather, catalogue of emblem books, if the term 'bibliography' is to be reserved to publications prepared according to the strict rules of the bibliographical method), I thought that even in its present imperfect state it may be of considerable use, giving as it does the widest survey of the field ever attempted so far, and thus achieving its aim as regards the history of culture; and it was with this aim in view, rather than from a purely bibliographical interest, that it was undertaken." It is not, therefore, a volume to be reviewed from the bibliographical standpoint—apart from the fact that probably only the compiler himself is fully equipped for that task. It is the reviewer's duty, however, to point out that Professor Praz's claims are completely justified, that this "catalogue" is "of considerable use," and does give "the widest survey of the field ever attempted so far"—from Alciati to Mrs. Gatty.

Owing chiefly to the pioneering work of Professor Praz, we may now see the emblem books as something more than literary curiosities which had a brief and largely inexplicable vogue and are now interesting only to collectors and dilettanti. No serious student of metaphysical or Baroque poetry can now afford to ignore the emblem books. They were typical and expressive of the age which produced them in the same way, and to the same extent, as the metaphysical conceit. Donne's too well-known image of the compasses is the most obvious illustration of this fact. As an emblem this image was a seventeenth-century commonplace and the distinguishing sign of the Plantin printing press at Leyden. In general, both conceit and emblem were essentially attempts to embody and communicate in concrete form emotions, thoughts, and moral ideas, however elusive or intangible. Both express that desperate search for certainty

which was one aspect of that age of uncertainty, discovery, and revolution, and which led in the fields of religion and politics to some of its most fantastic and brutal excesses.

The development of modern science and scientific assumptions and modes of thought rapidly brought to an end the taste for emblem and conceit, both of which had their origins in the medieval habit of allegory and the conception of "correspondences," and both of which combined sensuous and didactic tendencies in a manner which science and rationalism rendered antiquated and somewhat ridiculous. Even more than metaphysical poetry the emblem books after a century of incredible flourishing passed out of fashion or, worse, like the faculty of imagination as seen by Mr. Hobbes, passed into the hands of children.

A resuscitation of emblem books today for their intrinsic interest is neither likely nor much to be desired, but we do find the seventeenth century a subject of considerable interest, and will probably continue to do so. The detailed interactions during that period of the emblem books and literature proper remains an interesting field of study, and a relatively unworked one. Miss Rosemary Freeman has recently dealt with the subject in English, but much remains to be done, especially in the way of tabulating and correlating parallel ideas and images in emblems and poetry. For any student in this field, indeed for any student desirous of a full understanding of the intellectual climate of the seventeenth century, Professor Praz's illuminating first volume and this full and scholarly "catalogue" are essential.

T. H. Jones

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

The Triumph of Form: A Study of the Later Masters of the Heroic Couplet. By Wallace Cable Brown. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1948. Pp. viii + 212. $3.50.

This book concentrates on that metrical form which, next to blank verse, has proved the most dependable medium for English poetry. It considers the pentameter couplet during the eighteenth century, when the full exploitation of its possibilities made it into the "heroic couplet." Origins and decay are sketched in a Prologue and Epilogue; Dryden and Pope, since their mastery is acknowledged and has often been analyzed, are used principally to furnish points of reference. This structure allows Professor Brown to write a study in technical aesthetics by limiting himself to five successors of the masters: Gay, Johnson, Churchill, Goldsmith, and Crabbe. Young and Cowper also share a chapter. Such concentration turns up paying ore.

The game is obviously not to find who can succeed to the drugget robe of a Flecknoe. It is not even to nominate Mr. Heroic Couplet Post-Pope, for Professor Brown admits that Dryden and Pope adumbrated all important uses and characteristics, and stamped perfection on the heroic couplet. The author's thesis is that *within the tradition*, and while "imitating" in the best neo-classic sense, the later masters impressed their own geniuses upon the form. The names of those who carried on the succession of the state become, therefore, five sweet symphonies: Gay is the neo-classic norm; Goldsmith knows how to introduce lyrical and musical elements, and in passages can rise to the massive nobility of Johnson's usage; Young and Cowper, with no instinctive flair for the couplet, demonstrate how a technique and a tradition may shape a poet's voice, rather

than the romantic obverse; Churchill turns the couplet to irony, as Crabbe explores its possibilities for narrative.

The heroic couplet must necessarily be the touchstone of this book. The reader therefore turns with each of the later masters to such considerations as: end-stops; lines of three, four, five, or six beats; syntactical repetitions; parallels and contrasts; vertical alliteration; substitution; the use or abuse of the caesura; balance achieved through a pyrrhic used as the third foot, plus possible variations and asymmetry; the effects of strong verbs used as rhyme words, or of poly-syllables within the line. Quite properly, the analyses are so minute that it is even possible to determine Professor Brown's particular readings: that he does not imagine Waller might have accented "July" on the first syllable (p. 10); that in doubtful cases he prefers iambs to spondees and will assign five stresses to a line that I would read almost with eight (p. 14: see also line 58 on p. 32); that he finds alliteration in word-pairs such as "pride" and "prevent," "secure" and "slights" (pp. 19 and 159); that he assumes a line should have but one caesura (p. 35). Sometimes his judgments seem a bit mechanical, as when he finds Root's admirable description of the poetic process a "far cry" from Mac-Leish's celebrated definition (pp. 36-37); or denies that Doctor Johnson had a bad ear (p. 74: anyone who could not hear the music in "Lycidas" must have been at least partially deaf); or makes Churchill, that spiritual son of Dryden, into a follower of Pope in technical arguments which come near to maintaining that Dryden's formulas of triplets and alexandrines gave him a variety that Pope lacked (pp. 94-102). And occasional phrases—"*dramatic* tension" (pp. 26, 43), "non-imitative realistic description" (p. 60)—fall short of the inevitable word. But such minor points of difference must occur in a work devoted to close prosodic analysis.

Professor Brown is often at his best in taking the hints of other authorities—Root, Eliot, Van Doren, Tillotson, Winters—and applying them with systematic rigor. Any prosodist, and any contemporary poet, however cool to the couplet he may be, should find this volume a valuable and painstaking scrutiny of the tricks of the trade.

But system creates its own embarrassments. The heroic couplet turns out to be inappropriately named. A more exact *technical* adjective than "heroic" might be "stanzaic," or "autonomous," or "balanced"; a better *functional* adjective, considering its successes, would be "reflective," "argumentative," or "satiric." Furthermore, Professor Brown is frequently most interesting when he is most irrelevant—in sharply cut phrases that catch the traits of a poet; in his excellent and still-needed championing of the powerful and subtle irony of Churchill, that "Chatterton of neo-classic literature"; or in his discussion of the larger structural devices of Crabbe, which, as he rightly points out, make Crabbe a master in the short-story form, but which are achieved apart from, or in spite of, heroic couplets.

To list the various subject matters that have been treated within the form is of dubious philosophic or technical significance—comparable to noting that "The Schoolmistress" and "The Cotter's Saturday Night" are written in Spenserian stanzas. The title of the book seems a misnomer. The heroic couplet is a small *form,* though hardly—shades of Herrick!—"the smallest possible stanza" in English poetry. Within its narrow boundaries Dryden and Pope moved so triumphantly that they handicapped their successors as effectively as Shakespeare in dramatic, or Milton in narrative, blank verse. Most of the quotations in this book sound like the Survival of Form, and justify Cowper's lines about Pope:

But he (his musical finesse was such,
So nice his ear, so delicate his touch)
Made poetry a mere mechanic art;
And ev'ry warbler has his tune by heart.

It does little good to point out regarding these lines that the parenthesis enjambs the two couplets, "a variation that is also characteristic of Churchill"—for Pope himself had used it before 25 lines of *Rape of the Lock* were done (and for that matter, within the first half-dozen of *Essay on Man*). The possible variations within genuine heroic couplets may be almost exhaustively typed. This book demonstrates such variations. Its minute technical considerations are of great value, for they increase respect for language and sensitivity to craftsmanship. To go further than technique is to abandon the heroic couplet as your subject, and to prove instead that a powerful poetic personality may turn any instrument to use.

DONALD A. STAUFFER

Princeton University

The Unsentimental Journey of Laurence Sterne. By ERNEST NEVIN DILWORTH. New York: King's Crown Press, 1948. Pp. xiv + 115. $2.25.

Mr. Dilworth's book purports to be a reinterpretation of Laurence Sterne. The Sterne that emerges from its pages is an inveterate jester, his ostentatious sensibility being but a part of his motley. This controversy regarding the relative merit of humor and pathos in Sterne is, as Mr. Dilworth is aware, as old as Sterne. Nor is there anything new in the assertion that Yorick is essentially a humorist. F. C. Green in his *Minuet* quotes from *Journal encyclopédique* the opinion of a Frenchman who met the novelist in Paris and wrote of him, "He seemed to us one of those men who possess an inordinate appetite for laughter, and for laughing at nothing and at everything indiscriminately. Now, we believe that a man with this sort of character can have very little of that sensibility of soul which is affected by Sterne in his writings." The point of Mr. Dilworth's book does not lie in the conclusion it reiterates; it lies in its able and energetic documentation of its case.

The author gives at the outset a résumé of what the nineteenth and the twentieth-century critics have been saying about Sterne. He then starts on his comprehensive survey of the two novels, the *Sermons*, the hectic *Journal to Eliza*, the *Letter Book*, and the letters of Sterne, eagerly spotting the passages that help him substantiate his thesis. He views the facts of Sterne's life and the impressions of the latter's contemporaries about his personality and art. He examines not only salient landmarks but also obscure nooks and corners. His erudition is impressive, and his critical comments are remarkable alike for their lucidity and verve.

Yet the book suffers from its very earnestness of purpose. The coexistence of tears and laughter in Sterne's writings is obvious; to maintain that it is easier to integrate his humor to his personality than his pathos is understandable; but to reject his sensibility as sham is to deny the complexity that is Sterne. The dead ass at Nampont and the living ass near Lyons, Uncle Toby's fly, Le Fever's erratic pulse-beat, and the derelict *disobligeant* in Monsieur Dessein's coach-yard may be only impish pranks that Sterne delights in playing upon his

readers. But it is rather difficult to accept as part of the joke his avowal in that note he left for his wife with Mrs. Montagu that he considers humanity and good nature more important than wit and humor. His similar statements in his letters to Lydia, Mrs. James, and Lord Shelburn do not lend themselves easily to Mr. Dilworth's interpretation that all such protestations are mere window-dressing. Besides, what is more important, *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey* themselves would not belie their author's sympathy and feeling. The intuitive understanding of human virtue and failings out of which spring the vivid and amiable figures of Uncle Toby, Corporal Trim, and La Fleur is itself poetic in character. Mr. Dilworth's approach to his subject is a negative one; he does not enlighten us so much about Sterne's humor as he is anxious to put us on our guard against his sensibility.

One may or may not agree with Mr. Dilworth's point of view, yet one cannot but admire him for his relentless pursuit of his objective. Altogether, this study is a welcome addition to the existing books on Sterne. It is informative as well as critical. The author tries to catch something of Yorick's exuberance and insouciance, but he does not let this interfere with his sense of responsibility as a critic. The book has appeal for both the specialist and the lay reader.

D. P. Vidyarthy

King's College, London

Wordsworthian Criticism: A Guide and Bibliography. By James Venable Logan. Columbus: Ohio State University Graduate School Monographs, Contributions in Languages and Literature, No. 12; fourth in the English Series, 1947. Pp. xii + 304.

Professor Logan divides his book into an analytical survey of the principal Wordsworthian criticism dating from the poet's own day to the present and a selected bibliography for the years 1850 to 1944, prefaced by a brief list of the important criticism by Wordsworth's contemporaries. Of 661 items in the bibliography, approximately three-fourths are from 1916 (when Harper's biography appeared) to 1944. This is an indication both of Professor Logan's emphasis, and of the quantity and importance of Wordsworthian criticism during the last thirty years. Quite rightly, I think, Professor Logan limits his nineteenth-century bibliography to books and articles of major importance, on the assumption that more extensive lists are readily available in the catalogues of the Cornell and Amherst collections. The twentieth-century bibliography is relatively complete, the main omissions being of articles and notes which have been superseded or absorbed into later writings, and of books which deal only incidently with Wordsworth. Each item is accompanied by a brief summary which indicates the nature of its contribution and frequently relates it to other items. A list of reviews is appended to the comments on the most important books. Two excellent indexes are supplied: one of proper names and subjects (the subject listings under Wordsworth are remarkably detailed and thorough) and one of titles. Doubtless every Wordsworthian scholar will search vainly for references he would have included and deplore the inclusion of those he would have omitted, but, in general, specialists and beginning students alike will find that Professor Logan has provided an excellent working bibliography.

The survey which occupies the first part of the book is informative rather than critical in intent and is therefore of most value to the beginning student. Pro-

fessor Logan selects and summarizes those writings of the early nineteenth century, the Victorians, and the Moderns which, he believes, indicate main critical trends and principal points of view. Modern criticism is discussed under three groupings: biographical, philosophical, and aesthetic. Whenever possible he quotes at length, allowing the author to present his purpose in his own words. But except for an occasional mention of the limitations inherent in an attitude, he makes little attempt to evaluate the contributions he selects. Consequently the survey is disappointing. True, Professor Logan has done conscientiously what he set out to do, but I am sorry that he has been so cautious. Here was a wonderful opportunity to make a much-needed appraisal of modern Wordsworthian criticism; to take stock not merely of its accomplishments, but also of its excesses, its limitations, and its failures; to speculate on what should be the concern of future criticism; and even to weigh the present-day reputation of Wordsworth, nonacademic as well as academic, against the criticism.

Every reader of Professor Logan's survey will, I imagine, be tempted into drawing some conclusions and asking some questions of his own. I know I was. It is evident, for example, that Wordsworth is today securely in the protective hands of the academics. Few others seem to want him or even to care about what happens to him. As a result, perhaps, little of the immense amount written during the last thirty years can truly be called criticism, though recently there have been a few hopeful signs, such as the symposium on the Intimations Ode in 1942, of a reawakening of critical interest. The most significant contributions have been in biographical and historical scholarship. The great bulk of writing—especially during the last decades—has been on the philosophy of Wordsworth. And this writing decidedly needs evaluation, as Professor Logan's summary of the confused and contradictory interpretations makes clear. There has been a careless throwing around of such abstractions as naturalism, transcendentalism, imagination, and mysticism. The indiscriminate use of the latter word is particularly irritating; it seems to be employed whenever the writer does not comprehend or cannot explain something in Wordsworth or his philosophy or as an impressively easy way of indicating Wordsworth's and the writer's profundity. And the questions arise: how much of this writing is necessary and helpful in the understanding and appreciation of Wordsworth's poetry? How much of it uses Wordsworth simply as a means for perpetuating academic controversies? How much is no more than self-indulgent philosophizing by the critic? Matthew Arnold's attack upon those who elevated Wordsworth's philosophy above his poetry again becomes relevant, for the poet seems in more danger today than ever before of being murdered through dissection by Wordsworthians.

I am afraid that Professor Logan will be startled and perhaps annoyed by these speculations which, I am sure, he had no intention of provoking. Certainly I do not want to appear ungrateful for the valuable reference aid he has provided. But it seems to me that unless the survey leads the reader to speculation rather than complacency, it will be of little benefit to future Wordsworth critics.

Edward E. Bostetter

University of Washington

A Guide to Trollope. By WINIFRED GREGORY GEROULD and JAMES THAYER GEROULD. Drawings by FLORENCE W. EWING. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1948. Pp. xxv + 256. $5.00.

Anthony Trollope, of all novelists in the English language, is certainly the one whose works most call out for some sort of guide: his reader is continually looking back from whatever position he has reached, thinking over the material which has gone before, remembering distinctly its feeling and mood, but being puzzled by turns of plot that elude him, settings which he wishes to explore again, names of characters that puzzle and tease his memory. Trollope not only added a new shire to the English counties; he also added a substantially long shelf to any library of English fiction; and human memory being what it is, his reader frequently wants to grope back for facts, without sacrificing unread works for ones previously gone through. It is this purpose that *A Guide to Trollope* serves admirably. In addition, the inclusion of a convenient reference to major works relating to Trollope, the classification of his works in the way that Nichols, Sadleir, and Walpole each drew it up, and the excellent maps of Mrs. William Ewing round out the service performed by this book.

As in the case of all good guides, one of the great merits of this one lies in its simplicity of arrangement. The body of the work consists of titles of Trollope's fiction and names of his characters arranged in alphabetical order. The characters are generously identified, part of their descriptions frequently being quotations from the books in which they appear; the résumés of the novels have as a special merit their length, more extended and thorough than in the usual book of summaries. Preceding the accounts of the novels are the date of the first edition and its publisher and brief excerpts of criticism by the author and other writers. Also included in the identification of the stories are the names of the magazines in which they first appeared. Whimsically appropriate to a book on Trollope is the statement by the authors in their preface that "we have inserted in the list a grouping by names of the doctors, lawyers, moneylenders and Americans appearing in the novels, students of the various universities and colleges. . . ." Trollope would have loved the parallelism.

The *Preface* consists of a graceful little essay on Trollope, its examples of his sometimes failing to remember accurately the names of his own characters constituting a reminder that he was not the cold, calculating writer, completely lost in word-counting, that the late Victorians, caricaturing his description of himself in his *Autobiography*, assumed him to have been.

The *Guide* is a thoroughly worthwhile performance, a substantial contribution to a wider acquaintanceship on the part of many with the fiction of Anthony Trollope. One rather wishes that reference to works that were not fiction had been included. However, considering the fullness of the book, this omission is hardly a fault; rather, its inclusion would have been an act of supererogation.

JOHN HAZARD WILDMAN

Louisiana State University

The Miraculous Birth of Language. By RICHARD A. WILSON. With a Preface by GEORGE BERNARD SHAW. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948. Pp. 256. $3.75.

Professor Wilson's thorough-going "mentalistic" approach to a subject as fascinating as the origin of language will provide a surprising shock for linguists

everywhere. His statement, "to a mechanist many of the terms which I have used may appear altogether unwarranted or quite wrong" (p. 245), while begging a legitimate basis for his theory, clearly indicates the nature of his argument. For he has employed deductive logic in order to expound a philosophical hypothesis based on teleological assumptions regarding language development. In this way he ignores the current premises of linguists who are unwilling to speculate on a subject so devoid of fact and purpose, disposing of them with names such as "mechanist" or "Neo-Darwinian," and exhibiting them as being an equally confused, misguided minority, leaders of a "revolt which has rather outlived its usefulness" (p. 178).

As a matter of fact, linguistics has made its greatest progress since allying itself with pragmatism in philosophy and behaviorism in psychology: it has profitably adopted the aims of such disciplines and relinquished to them their proper studies in this respect—logic and biology. And it will be clear to linguists that Professor Wilson's entire discussion could be dissipated pragmatically by the same means which he uses to invalidate the statements of Darwin.

Professor Wilson does, however, succeed in demonstrating the "miracle of language" with at least one remarkable fact, namely, that all known languages manifest a highly developed symbolism; none is lacking in expressiveness, despite their varied structures. A rough indication of this "miracle" is observed in the facility of translation among languages taken at random.

One very intriguing, and relatively unexplored, phase in the history of ideas can be found in the early chapters of the book. Here some very influential and symptomatic attitudes toward language are revealed in the light of their historical development.

The lengthy preface by G. B. Shaw deserves credit as a work in itself and cannot be regarded as supplementing Professor Wilson's remarks. Shaw deplores the state of English spelling, demands an orthography that will reflect the spoken word, and looks for a solution in the narrow phonetic notation of Henry Sweet. After this, he confounds and delights the reader with interesting comparisons of English dialect differences, concluding that his proposed spelling reforms must be legislated, lest there be as many orthographies as there are dialects. One wonders what he might have added if he had ever caught up with the work of Leonard Bloomfield and his "mechanistic" followers (such as Robert Hall, Bernard Bloch, George Trager, George Lane, *et al.*) who have already answered many times the challenge implied by Professor Wilson and the dilemma encountered by Shaw.

Carroll E. Reed

University of Washington

Richard Beer-Hofmann: Werk und Weltbild des Dichters. By Otto Oberholzer. Bern: A. Francke, 1947. Pp. 272. s.fr. 18.—.

It might be surprising, at first glance, to find a study on Beer-Hofmann of more than 270 pages, if one considers that the total literary output of the poet who died in his seventies probably does not exceed that number by much. Upon reading the text, however, it soon becomes evident that, although Oberholzer is genuinely convinced of his author's lasting importance and his incisiveness upon the men of *Jung Wien,* he uses him, to some degree at least, as an object of demonstration and a point of departure for his stimulating and provocative

method of mythologically symbolical analysis in literary criticism. This approach is not exactly new, for it has found its eloquent protagonists especially in the Swiss school of Faesi, Staiger, Naef, and others (the impact of Jung must be very considerable). Oberholzer, by his very devotion to his author and the neatness of his expression which, fortunately, is quite free of the *geisteswissenschaftliche* jargon (a thing that cannot exactly be said of Naef's Hofmannsthal book), in general succeeds well in making a very persuasive argument for his case. This reviewer by no means sees eye to eye with him in all instances; on the contrary, he takes exception to some of the fundamental deductions in Oberholzer's interpretations of Beer-Hofmann's individual works. But on the whole, he gladly admits that this book is one of the most challenging and thought-provoking studies to reach his attention lately.

The leitmotif is sounded in the very beginning, when the author says of Beer-Hofmann: "Die Bedeutung seiner Kunst liegt weniger in Kompositorischen oder im Sprachlichen als hauptsächlich im Symbolischen." This attitude is not an isolated phenomenon in Beer-Hofmann; rather it is quite ubiquitous and especially prevalent among the Viennese impressionists. He sees, however, evidences of it also in other lands and movements, in d'Annunzio, the Baroque, Grillparzer, even Keller, Storm, Hauptmann, Wassermann, Thomas Mann, and others. In his concluding chapter he has some penetrating things to say about the symbolical nature of creative work in which the true poet tries to express the ineffable in symbols. This is the core of all mythologies and rites; this is also the eternal source of man's endeavor to define his place in the cosmos. Ever since man has conceived of the cosmos as the constant battleground between the light and the dark forces, he has tried to take sides in this struggle and has applied certain universal symbols to it with either positive or negative denominators, depending on his mythological attitude. Oberholzer tries to establish these symbols in Beer-Hofmann's work, and from their prevalence he makes deductions of his *Weltanschauung*.

In the first part of the book, which was originally composed as a doctoral dissertation, Oberholzer establishes certain technical terms which are fundamental for Beer-Hofmann and his Viennese contemporaries, especially Hofmannsthal and Schnitzler. Having defined a historical period of a harmoniously developing culture as *ascendency*, in which material achievements serve the spirit, the author distinguishes between *decadence*, wherein, by a degenerative process, the spirit has become removed from life and, leading a strictly self-centered existence, trifles (*bagatelliesiert*) with the material foundations of life, and *depravation*, wherein conversely as a reaction to decadence the material world denies the reality of the spirit and triumphs over it in the glorification of brute force. Anticipating a later conclusion, it may be stated here that these opposing forces, so present in Viennese literature, are only more recent emanations of the eternal mythological struggle between *logos* on the one hand and chthonic powers on the other, between spirit and earth, between father and mother. The predominance of the one over the other ultimately always leads to a clash. Harmony can be achieved only if man, to use one of Beer-Hofmann's symbols, leaves his tower to descend to the valley, not to dwell there, but to return to the tower again—in other words, man who has found the equilibrium between the realm of the fathers and that of the mothers, between Apollo and Astarte, the man of spirit who does not withdraw into himself but lives an active life in the community.

The earlier works of Beer-Hofmann and Hofmannsthal and all writings of

Schnitzler, Oberholzer considers as belonging to the stage of decadence. At this juncture he introduces the term *pre-existence* borrowed from Hofmannsthal (via Naef), whose great admiration for, not to say dependence on, Beer-Hofmann is fully attested in the text. It is originally the Platonic idea of recollection or anamnesis of things experienced in previous existences or the anticipation of as yet unlived experiences. (In some ways it is related to Werfel's use of the *déjà vue* and Thomas Mann's concept of time, but not as it is used here.) It is the typical impressionistic attitude as best exemplified by Claudio in Hofmannsthal's *Der Tor und der Tod*, the egocentric aesthete who knows life only through his intellect. A prolonged period of pre-existence leads to the danger of missing the entrance into existence, the active life, and therein lies the tragedy of the weak hero of the impressionists. Though Beer-Hofmann's earlier characters seem to be arrested in their pre-existence, Oberholzer tries to prove by a daring stylistic analysis of symbols, viz., leaving a house, overcast skies, melting snow, smoke stacks, water, dreams, laborers, etc., that they already are on the point of leaving their pre-existential status and entering into an active existence. This final step Oberholzer sees definitely achieved in the David dramas and with that a radical shift from Near-Eastern mythologies to a Jewish symbolism of the Genesis. In passing, it might be pointed out that Oberholzer misinterprets Schnitzler and some of the other Viennese, by the statement that their characters are foredoomed to pre-existence. Their very presentation more than implies their moral condemnation, so that their lives cannot be accepted as exemplary. It is also rather puzzling to find Beer-Hofmann frequently anticipating Freud, whom he did not know then, unless he heard about him from Schnitzler.

This reviewer finds it particularly difficult to accept the author's interpretation of *Der Graf von Charolais*, or rather the emphasis within his interpretation. Oberholzer sees in it a fatalism which is Jewish and Austrian: "Hier geht es nicht um die Tragödie eines Einzelnen, sondern um die eines ganzen Zeitalters." The *Zeitalter* is the era of the decadent bourgeois, we are told. Though his arguments are at times beguiling, the author seems to be caught in the meshes of his own system and misjudges the significance of the tragedy which, in brief, might be termed the tragic failure of insular egocentrism, a theme thoroughly indigenous to the Viennese tradition. Beer-Hofmann presents here a whole series of wrong parent-child relationships, all caught in their specific egotisms. The overly correct Charolais is so much the little son of his great father that, living *sub specie patris*, he is incapable of a true emotion. Rochefort's late marriage and the education of his daughter is typical for the impressionistic hero's fear of old age and loneliness. Itzig lives for the revenge of his murdered father, and even the innkeeper creates a life of illusion for his blind father. In all children of the play the burden of their self-imposed obligation drains their own life blood and renders them incapable of living their own destinies. Least acceptable is the author's interpretation of Philip as the only representative of self-leaving ascendency. On the contrary, Philip is an outstanding example of impressionistic egotism, a first cousin of Schnitzler's Anatol, the butterfly, flitting from person to person, collecting hearts and souls and friendships, erecting monuments to himself, leaving memories behind, for he cannot bear the thought of loneliness, which is his due, nor the complete oblivion that comes to the egomaniac with death. He does not enter life, he does not give of himself, his existence is parasitical. Oberholzer is, however, right if he considers as one of the main motifs of this play and the story *Der Tod Georgs*: "Das Versagen des

Männlichen gegenüber der Frau." It would have been interesting to pursue this thought through early expressionism, especially in Werfel's *Die Mittagsgöttin* and *Spiegelmensch*. While on the point of expressionism, it should be mentioned that Oberholzer's analysis of *Jaakobs Traum* stops short of establishing the connecting line between Beer-Hofmann and the early expressionism by failing to see that Jacob's communion and sympathy with nature and his descent from Beth-El is an eschatological symbol of the redeemer of all creation, and not only of man. Seen in this light the lamb that dies in Jacob's arms, saving his life, becomes the *Agnus Dei*.

Movingly convincing as is the interpretation of *Der Junge David*, Oberholzer definitely overreaches himself in *Schlaflied für Miriam*, both in his symbolical analysis and his overestimation of the poem. The same may be said about the treatment of the essays.

The last part of the book is devoted to a very thorough and excellent general analysis of classes of symbols and symbols proper, perhaps the most constructive part of this fine study, and finally a statistical listing of symbols as used by Beer-Hofmann. The book is profusely and excellently annotated, showing the author's thorough familiarity with the field. The bibliography is quite complete. Anyone interested in *Jung Wien*, or in a fascinating approach to literary interpretation opening new vistas, will certainly enjoy this book.

Adolf D. Klarmann

University of Pennsylvania

Fifty Selected Poems with English Translations. By Rainer Maria Rilke. Translated by C. F. MacIntyre. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947. Pp. ix + 151. $3.50.

The Life of the Virgin Mary. By Rainer Maria Rilke. Translated, with an Introduction and Notes, by C. F. MacIntyre. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947. Pp. x + 55. $2.50.

In the introduction to his translation of *Fifty Selected Rilke Poems* MacIntyre says he was surprised to discover that there were almost as many Rilkes as there were Rilke commentators: "Every man had his own Rilke" (p. 1). And I am surprised at MacIntyre's surprise, for is not that true of every great artist? Who could count the number of Dantes, Shakespeares, and Goethes who have arisen over the years through the work of literary scholars and laymen. Inexhaustibility is an attribute of greatness, and by that token Rilke is a very great poet indeed. As a matter of fact, MacIntyre promptly decided to put aside most of these Rilkes and to present his own instead. The two volumes reviewed here must therefore be considered as MacIntyre's Rilke.

It is only fair to warn the reader that MacIntyre is biased in favor of Rilke's Apollonic qualities. That is why he restricts his choice to poems taken from the *Buch der Bilder* and the two parts of *Neue Gedichte*, disregarding entirely the *Stundenbuch*, *Duineser Elegien*, *Sonette an Orpheus*, and *Späte Gedichte*. He insists that his choice implies no criticism, but then proceeds to call the sonnets "foggy obfuscations." Furthermore he asserts that nowhere else but in the books of his choice is Rilke so finished an artist, which is equal to a denial of the art in the elegies and sonnets—surely an untenable position. In the second edition of his translations of the fifty Rilke poems he tries to correct this somewhat by

saying that he has translated the elegies and retracts the "unfortunate sentence on page 2" (p. 14). I wish he had done the same with the sentence on page 13 which starts with "unfortunately" and ends with "air-tight mystical balloons." It is hardly a mature description of Rilke's later work.

The most immediate impression gained from reading these translations is MacIntyre's inventiveness as a versifier. He has certainly taken Goethe's remark to Eckermann to heart. He has violated all the dicta of critics, has used false rhyme, alliteration, assonance, and consonance in profusion, and, as the reviewer in the *New Yorker* rightly pointed out with respect to MacIntyre's translations from Baudelaire, "as nearly as possible the word order of good prose." This is all very well and makes a readable volume, provided it is understood that Rilke does nothing of the sort. On the contrary, as far as rhyme and meter are concerned, he had a most meticulous ear. I have found but two instances in the fifty poems which MacIntyre translated where Rilke used a slightly slanted rhyme: *Winds—Anbeginns* (cf. MacIntyre, p. 24) and *vergangen—empfange* (p. 32). In all other cases Rilke's rhymes are Simon pure. In MacIntyre's version pure rhymes are the exception. He delights in slant rhymes to such an extent that frequently no rhyme pattern at all is recognizable. This, in addition to many metrical irregularities, produces the effect of prose, good prose maybe, but not poetry and certainly not Rilke's poetry.

It is quite true that Rilke uses rhyme and meter with great subtlety. Whenever his subject calls for it he introduces foreign words—note the abundance of French words in poems dealing with aristocratic decadence. I grant that such linguistic finesses are hard to translate, though some translators, Leishman for one, have occasionally succeeded. From reading MacIntyre's translations I got no impression of Rilke's extreme skill as a formal artist. While this is said by way of a general proviso, it is only fair to add that MacIntyre did an excellent job with the following poems: "Initiation," "Madness," "The Solitary," "Lament," "End of Autumn," "Solemn Hour," "Early Apollo," "A Woman's Fate," "Blue Hydrangeas," "The Courtesan," "Spanish Dancer," "The Flamingos."

His failure in others is due to a number of reasons. For example, when he renders the first two lines of Rilke's poem "Herbst": "Die Blätter fallen, fallen wie von weit, / als welkten in den Himmeln ferne Gärten"—"The leaves fall, fall as if from far away, / like withered things from gardens deep in sky" he destroys the iambic pattern of Rilke's verse—so well suited to the subject—and produces an opening line which, even with a long pause after the first "fall," remains obdurate. The added metaphor "like withered things" is particularly unfortunate. Rilke would not, I am sure, have compared "leaves" to "withered things." For this is precisely what Rilke's *Dinge* did not do, they did not wither. Leaves *wither*—things *are*. Leishman's version of the same poem (cf. Rainer Maria Rilke, *Selected Poems*, translated by J. B. Leishman [London: Hogarth Press, 1945], p. 22) is much more successful: "The leaves are falling, falling as from far, / as though above were withering farthest gardens."

I experience a similar sense of failure with MacIntyre's translation of Rilke's famed "Panther." In the poem "Der Schwan" MacIntyre wrongly links the subject *diese Mühsal* in a relative clause to *Ungetanes*. His version of "Der Einsame" is an excellent illustration of the snares and pitfalls that lie in the path of the Rilke translator, and MacIntyre has missed Rilke's point completely. I am not too happy with Leishman's version either, but he at least does not miss the point, as a comparison of the two translations will readily reveal.

MacIntyre's second volume of Rilke translations, *The Life of the Virgin Mary,* is an altogether more competent job. Here rhyme and meter reflect more accurately Rilke's art, and I have not noticed any important mistakes. In the "Birth of Christ" (p. 18) he seems to have misread *Maße* for *Masse,* because he translates it as *matter.* There is a misprint in the German text on page 34; it should be *schenkte* instead of *schenckte.* In general it should be understood that Rilke did not consider the *Marienleben* of great importance. He felt uneasy about its Catholic Christian piety from which he became entirely alienated. However, MacIntyre is right; that does not detract from the poetic value of this series. Whatever Rilke's personal convictions about Christianity, the little volume deserves to be read because it restates in artistically convincing terms those great myths upon which Western civilization is based.

H. F. Peters

Reed College

Stefan George und Thomas Mann: Zwei Formen des dritten Humanismus in kritischem Vergleich. Von Hans Albert Maier. Zürich: Speer Verlag, Zweite Auflage, 1947. S. 192. fr. 7.50.

Hans Albert Maier ist ein feinsinniger Kenner literarischer Strömungen. Sein Versuch, zwei wesensverschiedene Dichter wie Stefan George und Thomas Mann unter dem Gesichtspunkt des Humanismus einander gegenüberzustellen, fußt auf gründlicher Kenntnis und auf entscheidenden persönlichen Bildungserlebnissen, die sich an die Namen Stefan George und Thomas Mann knüpfen. Und doch nimmt jeder Kritiker, der im fünften Jahrzehnt des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts einen solchen Vergleich als Thema wählt, von vornherein einen gefährdeten Standpunkt ein, der sich kaum auf lange Sicht als haltbar erweisen dürfte. Denn eine gärende Zeit erzeugt ungeheure Horizontverschiebungen; auch der beobachtete Gegenstand scheint sich unruhig im Blickfeld in wechselnder Beleuchtung zu bewegen. Da auf der einen Seite ein seit 1933 abgeschlossenes Gesamtwerk steht, auf der andern dagegen ein noch in der Gestaltung begriffenes, verliert die Zeitgenossenschaft, die im Leben und Dichten nie zu einer Weggenossenschaft führte, langsam an Wichtigkeit. "Niemand bleibt ganz, der er war, indem er sich selbst erkennt." Dieses Wort, das Thomas Mann im Vorwort zur einbändigen amerikanischen Ausgabe seiner Joseph Geschichten schrieb (1948), begleitet wie ein Motto alle, auch seine jüngsten Werke, so daß eine Abhandlung über Thomas Manns Humanismus, die mit dem Joseph-Roman abschließt, allzuschnell veraltet. Zweifellos hat der Verfasser während seiner Arbeit die Erschütterung gespürt, die alles um ihn her packte, selbst den Begriff des Humanismus; aber trotz eines 1946 hinzugefügten Nachworts hat er das Gesetz der Wandlung nicht konsequent genug in die Untersuchung einbezogen. Ein zu bestimmtes Urteil läßt, wenn es verfrüht kommt, weder Raum für die Wandlungsmöglichkeit im Schaffen des Dichters, noch für etwaige neue Schlußfolgerung in der Kritik.

Fesselnd werden vom Verfasser Zusammenhänge und Wechselbeziehungen dargelegt, wie der Zeitgeist sie im Frühwerk beider Dichter hervorrief. Ähnliches und Gegensätzliches in Form und Gehalt wird hervorgehoben, wie es z. B. in folgenden Punkten sich zeigt: in der Einstellung zum Wert des Wortes; in einer Vorliebe für die Darstellung jugendlicher Gestalten; in der Zeichnung und Einfügung reifer Selbstbildnisse in die eigene Dichtung; in der Wiederkehr

gewisser Stimmungen und Motive wie Verfall, Einsamkeit, Sittlichkeit, Heldentum. Auch die Neigung zu aesthetischen Betrachtungen und gemeinsames Interesse für die selben Gestalten führt zu Vergleichspunkten, z. B. bei Platen, Fontane, Nietzsche.

Die Rolle allerdings, die Nietzsche im Weltbild Thomas Manns spielt, trägt bedeutendere Züge als in der Darstellung Dr. Maiers. Leidensvoller und intensiver stellt sich das Verhältnis dar, wie Thomas Mann selbst kurze Zeit nach dem Erscheinen von Dr. Maiers Abhandlung vor aller Welt in seinem Nietzsche Essay und in seinem von Nietzsche durchtränkten Roman *Doktor Faustus* kund gibt; so hat nicht nur die Kritik, sondern auch Thomas Mann selbst von einem "Nietzsche Roman" gesprochen. Da der *Doktor Faustus* außerdem auch ein Musiker-Roman ist, sollte nach Adrian Leverkühns Kompositionen und Wendell Kretzschmars musiktheoretischen Analysen Thomas Manns Verhältnis zu Beethoven, zu Bach, zur Musik überhaupt in ganz neuem Lichte dastehen. Vielleicht dürfte sich gerade die von Dr. Maier abgelehnte Bezeichnung eines "versetzten Musikers" einmal als besonders treffend für Thomas Mann herausstellen.

Wir lehnen auch die George-Verwandtschaft ab, die aus der Landschaft in Hans Castorps Schneesturm-Vision abgeleitet wird. Sollte hier nicht vielmehr Nietzsche der große Anreger sein, der im letzten Abschnitt in der "Geburt der Tragödie" vom Menschen forderte, sich in eine "althellenische Existenz" zurück zu versetzen?

Ähnlich überholt erscheinen uns Ausführungen über Thomas Manns "Verständnislosigkeit für den Süden," über "seine Gleichgültigkeit für die bildende Kunst," über das "Fehlen eines plastischen Gefühls" (vgl. meinen Aufsatz, "Das plastische Element im Joseph Roman," *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht,* XXXVII [1945], 417-27). Das erschütternde Dürer-Erlebnis, das aus den Kompositionen Leverkühns geradezu hervorleuchtet, bestätigt, daß von Tonio Krögers Michelangelo-Begeisterung über Hans Castorps Pietà eine aufsteigende Linie zu Dürers Melancholia führt.

Auch das Verhältnis Thomas Manns zu Schiller glauben wir anders deuten zu dürfen. Seit frühen Tagen scheint Thomas Mann sich dieser Geistesverwandtschaft bewußt gewesen zu sein, wie jene großartige Schiller-Huldigung "Schwere Stunde" beweisen mag, oder die vielfachen Auseinandersetzungen über *Don Carlos* (in *Tonio Kröger, Der Zauberberg, Unordnung und frühes Leid*), die Schiller-verwandte antithetische Stilart Gustav Aschenbachs, Schillers Bild in *Lotte in Weimar* und manche Äußerung über Schillers Essays.

Trotz unserer vielen Einwendungen muß das Buch als anregend und aufschlußreich bezeichnet werden. Es ist durchaus charakteristisch für eine Generation, die sich von Fritz Strich und Ernst Bertram anregen ließ. Vor dem ersten Weltkrieg wurden schon die Namen George und Mann in Universitätsvorlesungen miteinander verknüpft; und in der Tat dürfte einmal die Literaturgeschichte Ernst Bertram *das* Bindeglied zwischen George und Thomas Mann nennen.

Auf einige Anglizismen sei kurz hingewiesen: S.147, Z.22; S.158, Z.10; S.182, Z.37; u.a.; an Druckfehlern seien genannt: S.91, Z.28; S.147, Z.2 von unten.

Anna Jacobson

Hunter College

Cántico fe de Vida. Por Jorge Guillén. México: Litoral, 1945. Pp. 412. $3.75. Distributed in U.S.A. by Macmillan Company.

Entre lo que se dice del poema y el poema mismo existe una distancia inmensa; entre lo que se dice del poema, razonamiento de la emoción experimentada, y el poema, está la poesía. Aunque de los de Guillén digamos que han sido elaborados en presencia de la inteligencia del poeta alerta, trabajo hecho, el caso es que no parece menor, quizá más esforzado, el trabajo por hacer del que lee, analiza o valora el poema, y tal vez por eso mismo. Un teorema no guarda secretos una vez entendido, y esta comprensión puede ser compartida. Podríamos decir de un poema lo que en el mismo haya de teoría; nos quedamos con su secreto incomunicable, secreto lírico bajo siete llaves, con lo no delatable, que es la poesía.

Poesía secreta decimos de esta de 'Cántico'; y, en seguida, poesía pura. Pura, sin relato, sin lo que Ortega llama 'la razón narrativa,' sin historia, sin tiempo, desasida de concretas circunstancias. 'No acusa ningún espacio,' dice Azorín en 'Isla en el tiempo' ('Ahora' [Madrid, 1935]), y por ello, para esta indeterminación, su esfuerzo por eludir los artículos, los determinativos (y así se alude, según Amado Alonso a la esencia más que a la existencia de las cosas): 'Arden nubes.' 'Torres se doran amigas'—'Estrellas hay que son también paisaje.' Sin enunciación apenas para lo cual se ha extirpado a veces, lo cual es siempre un poco doloroso, el corazón del verbo. Por eso, más que afirmar, su comentado 'Sí' creo que sobre todo es una exclamación, una nota musical más que un compromiso teórico, una nota de su cántico. No dice; no cuenta; canta. Aunque lo cantado así sean muchas veces ciertos entes, figuras, ideas, sombras. Y por ello su música es mejor armonía arquitectónica, música sinfónica que comenta el cántico eterno de los seres y las cosas, los álamos y las columnas, los diedros de las esquinas y el esquema de la luna, que música melódica. Armonía, claridad, simetría de las arquitecturas, las ciudades, los astros. Se llega por otro lado a la solución del volumen de la esfera y al cálculo de la belleza del mundo, al cálculo de las cualidades. Su comentado 'El mundo está bien hecho' pertenece a esta geometría calificativa, si es posible hablar de ella. Con todo esto tiene mucho que ver no sólo la estructura interna, ajustada a la expresión mental, sino la estructura externo o formal de sus poemas, en los que advertimos tantos usos métricos del pasado (verso de nueve sílabas del Modernismo, en 'A la intemperie') como usos inéditos.

Cántico sin lamento, sin el largo lamento español, más contenido en la meseta que en el litoral, o quizá con un nuevo modo mas auténtico de lamento, que no signifique protesta, así como su serena alegría no valdrá como simple compromiso; como sublimación de sus sentimientos de desasido. Tampoco en Calderón o en Fray Luis hay llanto espectacular; pero sin la sal de las lágrimas, sal del mundo, toda perfección humana se corrompería. Sin ese rocío, que ha dejado como herencia su sal y en ella su luz, no hay poesía 'humana' y la de Jorge Guillén lo es. Clara y cálidamente humana.

J. Sanchez-Trincado

University of Washington

French. By ROBERT A. HALL, JR. Structural Sketches 1, Language Monograph No. 24. Supplement to *Language* 24. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1948. Pp. 56. $1.00.

Synchronic analysis of a familiar language with twenty centuries of documented linguistic history and ten centuries of literature is a curiosity, in that the analysis, by definition, must ignore history and literature. It is always a problem whether to describe the speech of the man-on-the-street who, in the end, makes his own language and ours, or to describe some educated standard with traditions often running counter to the free development of natural speech. Professor Hall has too good an ear and at the same time too much respect for the schoolmasters to perform with complete satisfaction to anybody the task he has set for himself.

For instance, he recognizes, at last, the vowel of F. *main* as that in E. *man*, not that in *men* (cf. my note, *Language* 16 (1940), p. 67); but, having made this observation, he reverts to the traditional symbol [ɛ̃], and he adds (§1.152.6): "when nasalization occurs" /i/ is "replaced" by /ɛ/ (etc.). Again, though noting the obsolescence of elegant "*a* fermé" as in *pas*, which has acquired the vowel in *patte*, he still prescribes that we distinguish *en*, *an*, from *on*, as in the cultured tradition. Further, positional variation in /e/ and /ø/ (open in closed syllables, close in open syllables) is duly noted, but the /o/ phoneme, which belongs with them (*cor*, *pot*, *Paul*, *chevaux*) is not worked into the pattern, and an exception is made for the spelling *-ai-* which he still gives as [ɛ] (*balai*, *je sais*, *je savais*), now pedantic. Tradition here overrules realistic observations and hampers a rational phonology. Space limitations preclude more detailed discussion.

One excellent section (pages 13-18) on the "effects of close juncture" (we used to call it sentence phonology), intonation, and related phenomena, records many keen observations on living French: [japatkwa] for *il n'y a pas de quoi*, [œ̃ʃfal] for *un cheval*, [askəʃkwa] for *à ce que je crois* (cf. §1.512.4b); the difference between the English implosives and the French final stops (E. *cap*, *rub*, *book* vs. F. *cap*, *robe*, *bouc*) is clearly noted and useful. A common traditional error might have been corrected: unstressed /e/, /ø/, /o/ are never really close, e.g., *élève* is [ɛlɛv], not [elɛv]. In *Liége* (*Liège*), *heureuse*, *chose*, and the like, close vowels in closed syllables occur before [z, ʒ], but whether to include [j], *r*, *v*, *vr*, *t*, *tr* (§1.521.1b) is debatable: *chapeau de paille* sounds natural with short *a* before [j], while retention of long *e* in *connaître*, *bête*, *maître* is a bit stagey, and I suspect to be charged to schoolroom "spelling pronunciation" rather than to natural tendency.

The traditional term "breath group" will someday be superseded by a descriptive term, such as "sense group," the point being simply that individual syllables may have so many different uses or combinations in French that, like letters of the alphabet, they must be associated in a certain minimum context before they make sense; and as soon as they have made sense, the intonation pattern marks off that group of syllables and permits a pause ("disjuncture") not at all related to breathing. This, incidentally, is why French poets cannot bear run-on lines.

From page 19 to the end, page 56, the work parallels closely our traditional school grammars, except that the esoteric terminology and abstract, nondescriptive formulae cannot be said to improve clarity. Thus "sandhi alternation of morphemes" (2.01) would suggest the same phenomena as "allophonic effects of close juncture" (1.511), but the new heading includes liaison, and cases like *fou:fol* having "non-automatically conditioned alternation"; these, along with

the verbs, remain mere irregularities in forbidding lists, where an occasional hint as to historical cause and effect would have made easy sense.

No language can be studied or described wholly in terms of its internal phenomena: comparison must be resorted to, in this case comparison with English. Here the traditional errors are perpetuated: English infinitives are invariably cited with *to* prefixed, so that *n'essayez pas de le reprendre* is glossed (§1.512.2) "de *of* + le *it* + reprendre *to take back*," where, of course, *de* is not "of" but the preposition syntactically matching English *to* before infinitive *reprendre* = *take back*, so *DE reprendre* = *TO take back;* "to be able to" for *pouvoir* effectually obscures the modal syntax: *il pourrait pleuvoir* does not mean "it would be able to rain," but *it might rain;* so with *falloir*, a transitive verb (*il faut une heure pour faire cela*) whose object may be another verb (infinitive), in which case *falloir* becomes a modal: *il ne faut pas pleurer, les enfants,* not "it is not necessary to" but *you mustn't cry, children;* the old "some-or-any" partitive is here, too, including the meaningless "*de* alone," while the omission of the definite article in compounds (*fils de roi* vs. *fils du roi*), which is important, is missed; tradition makes *rien* and the rest inherently negative, as they are not (*y a-t-il rien de plus évident?*), makes *point* = *pas du tout*, and waters down the very strong *guère* to "hardly" ("What, never?" "Well, hardly ever" illustrates the misconception); the subjunctive, one of the simplest and clearest items in all French grammar, here receives the traditional complicated treatment, including "compound conjunctions," though considerably condensed. But an end must be made; and I have tried my hand at these things elsewhere (in my *Modern Introductory French Book* [New York: Oxford, 1932]).

Still wanted is an analysis, not of what the French *ought* to say, but what they *do* say, now, while "transition" is perceived (Passy, Dauzat, Fouché, etc.), and it would be well to have more than one set of observations, since no statement can be definitive so long as the language lives. Perhaps a foreigner could do it best, for he might be less inclined to defend a traditional taste where usage is changing.

If the synchronic analyst added footnotes with the pertinent historical suggestions (*fou:fol, sec:sèche,* etc.), and then put it all in plain English, the result would be well worthwhile.

Henry Dexter Learned

Temple University

Discours sur les Sciences et les Arts. By Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Critical edition by George R. Havens. New York: Modern Language Association of America Monograph Series, XV; London: Oxford University Press, 1946. Pp. xiii + 278. $3.00.

The publication of the critical edition of Rousseau's First Discourse by Professor Havens has met with a cool reception among Rousseau scholars and others in the United States. Were it not for the fact that the hostile criticisms mirror the recent trends in American scholarship, the appearance of this work and the comments upon it might be dismissed as another incident in Rousseau research. Our generation has reacted with violence against the minute literary research of the universities: the study of A's influence on B, of the origin of this or that phrase, of the date on which an author arrived in Paris. Emphasis is upon interpretation, upon philosophy, upon ideas, and this concern has provided many

a shallow student a popular avenue of escape from the exigencies of careful scholarship. The fact that the study of the meaning and impact of an author requires learning and judgment has not deterred a host of mediocre minds from engaging in alluring generalities as a substitute for painstaking work. So intrigued have we become with the interpretation of Montaigne's, Rabelais's, or Rousseau's thought that we appear to have lost the capacity of appreciating a work of sound scholarship when we meet one. Or we pay a cool tribute to the effort involved, but—

The merit of Havens' production does not lie in presenting a systematic picture of Rousseau's philosophy, either in general terms or in relation to the First Discourse. Nor did the editor allow himself to dwell upon Rousseau's or the First Discourse's "meaning" or "place" in the literature and thought of the world. These legitimate subjects have been treated by others, and—significantly enough—by Havens himself, in other places. The controversies about Rousseau's contribution to literature have arisen from a neglect of cold facts, and these facts, which in the editor's opinion must be the constant base on which any interpretative structure is built, Professor Havens has established. It is as a study of the background of the Discourse and of its sources in Rousseau's life and readings that the book must be judged. And it is a safe prediction that, much as future students may disagree with Havens' sparing *judgments,* evaluations will now be sounder as a result of the *facts* which he has brought to light.

Whence Rousseau's high regard for Sparta? Whence his accuracies or errors in historical references? What is the likelihood that the theme of the *Discours* was suggested by Diderot, and if that assertion is true, what is its importance? What reception did the work have among Rousseau's contemporaries? In what personal and social circumstances did Rousseau do his work? It is to questions like these that Havens devoted years of research, and his solid, objective findings will surely, for a long time to come, serve as a control on speculations regarding Rousseau's impact on thought and history. The erudition and understanding required for the study of Rousseau's sources will not soon be duplicated by men whose sole concern is interpretation.

This critical edition is, happily, published in most agreeable form. The 88-page introduction, written in good normal French, presents the pertinent information with regard to the background and reception of the *Premier Discours.* The text, reproducing that of the first edition, is presented in excellent, large print. The notes making up the commentary follow the text and occupy some ninety pages. It is here above all that Professor Havens shows his impressive mastery of the materials relating to the First Discourse. There follow: an appendix listing the various editions and translations; a bibliography, wisely including books and articles touching on the *Discours* even though their scope is more general; and a useful index. The whole is presented with systematic thoroughness, making this book an indispensable guide in the teaching and study of Rousseau.

A. C. KELLER

University of Washington

BOOKS RECEIVED

AMERICAN

Eby, Edwin Harold. A Concordance of Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* and Selected Prose Writings. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1949. Fascicle I. Pp. xii + 256. $4.00.

Willard, Charles E. Whitman's American Fame: The Growth of His Reputation in America after 1892. Providence: Brown University Press, 1950. Pp. 269. $4.00.

ENGLISH

Allen, Don Cameron (editor). A Strange Metamorphosis of Man, Transformed into a Wildernesse, Deciphered into Characters, London, 1634. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1949. Pp. xvii + 64. $3.00.

Baker, Joseph E. The Reinterpretation of Victorian Literature. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. vii + 236. $3.75.

Clifford, James L., and Louis Landa (editors). Pope and His Contemporaries: Essays Presented to George Sherburn. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950. Pp. viii + 278. $6.00.

Draper, John W. The Twelfth Night of Shakespeare's Audience. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1950. Pp. x + 280. $5.00.

French, J. Milton. The Life Records of John Milton, 1608-1639. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1949. Vol. I. Pp. x + 446. $5.00.

Graham, John, Jr. (editor). Letters of Thomas Carlyle to William Graham. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xx + 86. $2.50.

Hall, James, and Martin Steinman (editors). The Permanence of Yeats: Selected Criticism. New York: Macmillan Company, 1950. Pp. vi + 614. $5.00.

Lovell, Ernest J., Jr. Byron: The Record of a Quest. Studies in a Poet's Concept and Treatment of Nature. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1949. Pp. 270.

Lyon, Judson Stanley. *The Excursion*: A Study. New Haven: Yale University Studies in English, Vol. 114, 1950. Pp. x + 152. $3.75.

Matthews, William. British Diaries: An Annotated Bibliography of British Diaries Written between 1442 and 1942. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950. Pp. xxxiv + 339. $3.75.

Michel, Alfred. Robert Louis Stevenson: Sein Verhaltnis zum Bösen. Bern: A. Francke Ag. Verlag, Swiss Studies in English, Bd. 21, 1949. Pp. 190. 18 s.fr.

Peery, William (editor). The Plays of Nathan Field. Edited from the Original Quartos with Introduction and Notes. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1950. Pp. x + 346. $3.75.

Tuveson, Ernest Lee. Millenium and Utopia: A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1949. Pp. xi + 254. $3.50.

Vincent, E. R. Byron, Hobhouse, and Foscolo. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1950. Pp. 135. $2.75.

Walker, Roy. The Time is Free: A Study of *Macbeth*. London: Andrew Dakers, Ltd., 1949. Pp. xvii + 234. Distributed in U. S. A. by Macmillan Company.

Willey, Basil. Nineteenth Century Studies: Coleridge to Matthew Arnold. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. Pp. 288. $4.50.

German

Steinhauer, Harry, and William Sundermeyer. Introduction to German. New York: Macmillan Company, 1950. Pp. 181. $1.90.

Von Faber du Faur, Curt, and Kurt Wolff. Tausend Jahre Deutscher Dichtung. New York: Pantheon Inc., 1949. Pp. 600. $4.50.

Romance Languages

Atkinson, Geoffroy. Les Idées de Balzac, d'après La Comédie Humaine. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1949. Tomes III and IV. Pp. 116.

Bourgeois, André. René Boylesve et le Problème de l'Amour. Lille: Librairie F. Giard; Genève: Librairie E. Droz, 1950. Pp. 173.

Fellows, Otis E., and Norman L. Torrey (editors). Diderot Studies. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949. Pp. xiii + 191.

Green, F. C. The Mind of Proust. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1950. Pp. 546. $4.50.

Hall, Robert A., Jr. Leave Your Language Alone! Ithaca, N. Y.: Linguistica, 1950. Pp. xi + 254. $3.00.

Kern, Edith G. The Influence of Heinsius and Vossius upon French Dramatic Theory. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Extra Volume XXVI, 1949. Pp. 153. $4.00.

Kolb, Philip. La Correspondance de Marcel Proust: Chronologie et Commentaire Critique. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949. Pp. xiv + 464. $4.00, paper; $5.00, cloth.

Lancaster, Henry Carrington. French Tragedy in the Time of Louis XV and Voltaire, 1715-1774. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1950. 2 vols. Pp. xii + 662. $10.00 set.

Serís, Homero. Manual de Bibliografía de la Literatura Española. Primera Parte. Syracuse: Syracuse University, Centro de Estudios Hispánicos, Hall of Languages, 1948. Pp. xliii + 422.

Studies in French Language, Literature, and History. 23 Essays Presented to R. L. Graeme Ritchie. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1950. Pp. 260. $4.50.

Turkevich, Ludmilla Buketoff. Cervantes in Russia. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xv + 255. $4.00.

General

Bowers, Fredson. Principles of Bibliographical Description. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Pp. xvii + 705. $10.00.

Bowers, Fredson (editor). Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1949-50. Vol. II. Pp. 213. $5.00.

Hunt, Cecil. A Dictionary of Word Makers: Pen Pictures of the People behind our Language. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. Pp. 176. $3.75.

Jones, Charles W. (editor). Medieval Literature in Translation. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1950. Pp. 1004. $6.00.

Kurath, Hans. A Word Geography of the Eastern United States. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949. Pp. vii + 88. $4.00.